

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | | | | | Work Assignment Number 2-01 | | | | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number: | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-016 | | | Contract Period 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 Base Option Period Number 1 | | | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name Support for NPL Updates | | | | |
| Contractor COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION | | | | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW | | | | | |
| Purpose: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | | | | | Period of Performance From 08/01/2012 To 07/31/2013 | | | | |
| Comments: The purpose of this action is to initiate new work assignment 2-01 entitled "Support for National Priorities List (NPL) Updates" for Option Pd 1 and adds 17,420 hours of Level of Effort. The Contractor shall submit a Work Plan in accordance with the Contract. Contractor shall be advised that Technical Direction provided under the Base Period WA will be valid under the Option Period WA. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund Accounting and Appropriations Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SFO <input type="checkbox"/> (Max 2) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period: | | Cost/Fee: | | | | LOE: 0 | | | | |
| 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| This Action: | | | | | | 17,420 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 17,420 | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cumulative Approved: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name David Yogi | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number 703-347-8835 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |
| Project Officer Name Emily Johnson | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number: 703-603-8764 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |
| Other Agency Official Name Brian Nelson-Palmer | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number: 202-564-6190 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |
| Contracting Official Name Eric Schermerhorn | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number: 202-564-6095 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |

Performance Work Statement

Work Assignment Number: 2-01

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Title: Support for National Priorities List (NPL) Updates

B. Work Assignment Manager: David Yogi
US EPA
OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 347-8835, Fax (703) 603-9119
e-mail: yogi.david@epa.gov

Alternate Work Assignment Manager: Terry Jeng
US EPA
OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8852, Fax (703) 603-9119
e-mail: yogi.david@epa.gov

C. OBJECTIVE

This work assignment provides technical support to EPA in the Agency's technical review of sites that are candidates for the NPL updates under the revised Hazard Ranking System (HRS). The purpose of the technical review, known as the Quality Assurance (QA) review, is to ensure that the technical basis used to support a site listing decision is consistent with the revised HRS rule as defined in the December 14, 1990 Federal Register, as well as EPA's technical guidance.

This work assignment also has an information management component which supports HRS and NPL rulemaking activities. This includes NPL data tracking and information systems support.

D. BACKGROUND

Federal responsibility for the assessment and cleanup of sites contaminated by hazardous wastes resides with the U.S. EPA under the authority of several statutes, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA). The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI), is one of EPA's primary offices for implementation of CERCLA. In implementing the Superfund program, the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation must coordinate with other media, especially the Office of Water. A high proportion of Superfund Sites have exposure pathways through water, and specifically groundwater (e.g., groundwater remediation to protect drinking water sources and supplies). OSRTI and OW have established a

collaborative relationship to ensure that there is “one program” front in the protection of human health and the environment.

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) enacted in 1980, and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), provide the Federal Government broad authority for responding to the dangers posed by uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responded by developing the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which is a scoring system used to establish the National Priorities List (NPL). On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA revised the HRS, as required by SARA. The revised HRS became effective on March 14, 1991. The HRS is the primary mechanism used to add sites to the NPL.

The Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch (SARDB) in OSRTI is responsible for discovering sites, evaluating their potential threat to human health and the environment, implementing the HRS, proposing and adding them to the NPL and maintaining public information regarding these activities via the web and other OSRTI data systems. A key component of implementing the HRS is evaluating exposure pathways, including surface and groundwater contamination.

This Performance Work Statement to be used as a notice of a continuation of work currently being performed by CSC under WA 3-07, EPA contract # EPCO6085.

E. Quality Assurance:

The tasks in this assignment require the use of secondary data. Collection, use and analysis of data will governed by procedures described in the quality assurance project plan (QAPP) and consistent with the Agency’s quality assurance (QA) requirements. The project specific quality assurance requirements must be addressed in the monthly progress reports.

II. TASK DETAIL

The contractor shall perform the following tasks:

Task 0 – Work Plan and Budget Development

The contractor shall prepare a detailed work plan and budget for the accomplishment of the indicated tasks in accordance with the clause *Work Assignments* (EPAAR 1552.211-74), Alternate I. The work plan shall include cost estimates a description of: (a) proposed staff; (b) the number of hours and labor classifications proposed for each task, to include both prime contractor and subcontractor labor; and (c) a list of deliverables, with due dates and schedule for deliverables. This task also includes weekly telephone conferences between the WAM and the project manager, to coordinate and confirm task performance. The contractor shall also submit monthly progress and financial reports pursuant clause, F.2, MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT (EPAAR 211-70)

Prior to initiating any action under technical direction, the EPA WAM shall ensure that the technical direction falls within the scope of work for this Work Assignment. The contractor shall

charge and track time site-specifically whenever applicable. With a few exceptions where general support is given, most of the work under Task 1 (QA) and Task 3 (Technical Assistance) should be charged to specific sites. Site Spill Identifier (SSID) numbers used for tracking the sites shall be provided to the contractor by EPA for the purpose of site-specific charging.

TASK 1: QA Review

The EPA WAM will provide the contractor with HRS documentation records and associated references, either in hard copy or electronic format, following submittal to HQ by the EPA Regions. EPA HQ will inform the contractor which sites have been approved by EPA management to go forward for QA review. The contractor shall review the HRS packages to ensure that the HRS is properly and consistently applied. The contractor shall identify site package data gaps and shall support EPA in evaluating the adequacy of documentation supporting site scores to assure that the packages have the best chance of meeting legal challenges. The contractor shall assign a Regional Coordinator who will serve as that Region's point of contact for QA issues.

Upon receipt of each HRS site package, the contractor shall begin QA review which will include a documentation completeness check, qualitative reference check, mathematical/assigned values check, issue identification, next steps determination, and qualitative data documentation check. The contractor shall conduct the QA review based on the priorities identified in written Technical Direction by the EPA WAM and in coordination with the HQ RC. If at any time during QA issues are identified that could cause the site score to drop below 28.5 using the HRS, the contractor shall promptly alert EPA.

The contractor shall ensure and provide documentation that major contributing factors are technically defensible. The proportion of time spent during the QA review shall reflect the relative importance of the pathways and/or factors. The QA review shall be conducted for all information submitted in the HRS package, but the time taken to review portions of the package not contributing significantly to the overall site score shall be a small fraction of the time taken to review the significant portions of the site package.

Subtask 1 - QA Letter: After completion of QA on an HRS site package, the contractor shall prepare a QA letter. If major issues arise, the contractor shall discuss them with the Regional NPL Coordinator and the HQ Regional Coordinator (RC) prior to submittal of the QA letter. The purpose of this letter is to provide Headquarters and the Region with written comments on problems or weaknesses in site HRS packages. These letters should be comprehensive, such that once all problems cited in the letter are addressed, the site package will be ready to pass QA (in absence of new QA issues). Before the QA letter is sent, if there are unresolved issues, the contractor shall prepare a synopsis of the issues for the EPA WAM, with recommendations on how to resolve them. Upon completion, each QA letter shall be sent concurrently to the EPA WAM, the appropriate HQ Regional Coordinator (who serves as a HRS monitor) and EPA NPL Coordinator in the region unless otherwise instructed. The NPL Coordinator will then make the necessary changes to the HRS package and resubmit the revised HRS package to the contractor. There may be several rounds of QA letters and resubmissions. After all issues are addressed and

only editorial concerns remain, the contractor shall provide the EPA WAM and the Region with a redlined version of the HRS documentation record showing the proposed corrections. Once the Region has signed off on these corrections, the EPA WAM will notify the contractor who shall make these corrections, producing a final version of the HRS Documentation Record. The format of QA letter shall be consistent with the outline of Attachment #1.

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls: Following issuance of QA letter, the contractor shall have their Regional Coordinator and QA reviewers participate in conference calls when necessary with the EPA WAM, EPA HQ and the Regions to clarify issues and discuss areas of disagreement. The frequency of the conference calls shall be based on the need. This frequency will vary by Region and number of packages undergoing QA (Approximately 30 packages undergo QA per year). The contractor's Regional Coordinator and appropriate technical staff shall be responsible for reviewing site packages and discussing QA issues during the conference call. These same staff people shall have responsibility for reviewing the same site packages during any subsequent formal QA of the site package that takes place. The contractor shall provide the HQ RC, the NPL coordinator in the Region and the EPA WAM with conference call notes (telecons) within 3 business days following the call.

Subtask 3 - Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval: When QA review is complete, all issues have been addressed, and the HRS package is ready for proposal to the NPL, the contractor shall assemble final site packages for submission for final EPA approval. The final package shall include: narrative summary, pathway score sheets, and HRS documentation record. The contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that the narrative summary reflects any changes in the package resulting from QA review. The final package shall be delivered to the EPA WAM. The contractor shall also perform these steps for sites going final when there are HRS scoring or documentation record changes due to response to comments.

Subtask 4 - Support for NPL Rule Publication:

The contractor shall support activities related to NPL proposed and final rule publication. These activities include:

- 1) For each NPL rulemaking, delivering electronic versions of the HRS documentation records, supporting documentation and any other associated documents, if necessary. The contractor shall post these documents to the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) no later than 5 business days prior to FR publication (with the exception of last minute changes to documents by EPA).
- 2) For each NPL rulemaking, reviewing, formatting and creating PDFs with 508 compliance the narrative summaries for each site.
- 3) On an as-needed basis, preparing any necessary public information documents and background information. This shall be tasked via TD by the EPA WAM.

Subtask 5 - Intensive QA:

Under certain cases where EPA perceives a high risk of litigation regarding a site, EPA may task the contractor to perform one or more of the following tasks:

- (1) Review Sampling Documentation and Procedures
 - (a) Review sampling logbooks and primary sampling reports (e.g., ESIs, RI/FSs, etc.) from cover to cover to ensure that documentation is accurate/consistent for key samples and key sample locations, and that sample location maps are consistent with sample location descriptions.
 - (b) Review whether field standard operating procedures (SOPs) for collection of critical samples were documented in the HRS package and whether, based on information presented in the HRS package (e.g., logbooks, primary sampling reports), SOPs were followed. Request sampling SOPs and sample plans, as needed.
 - (c) Review chain of custody forms to ensure that samples are consistently identified (or adequate information is provided to definitively cross-walk sample IDs).
- (2) Review Data Quality
 - (a) Review chain of custody forms to ensure that holding times were met. Review sample handling procedures and sample preservation and identify field duplicates.
 - (b) Evaluate whether adequate QC samples (field blanks, duplicates, etc.) were collected.
 - (c) Review laboratory reports and/or data validation reports/procedures to identify deviations from laboratory QC guidelines. In cases where deviations from sample handling procedures or laboratory QC guidelines are apparent review whether either: 1) deviations are accounted for through data validation; or 2) adequate information is provided in the HRS package to validate the data, if necessary. Review whether analytical data are adjusted according to HRS policy.
- (3) Ensure Package Integrity
 - (a) Examine information included in references with the HRS package but not used in scoring to identify issues that could be raised during response to public comments or that could contradict the scoring strategy.
 - (b) Ensure that documentation included in the HRS package (e.g., maps, field logbooks, etc.) is adequate to characterize and/or rule out contributions from other potential sources in the area.

TASK 2: Technical Assistance

Subtask 1 - Trips to Regions: The contractor shall travel to the Region in response to special requests for pre-HRS and HRS technical support. These requests will be relayed to the contractor by the EPA WAM through written technical direction. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest to the Region, shall provide the Region with technical support in the following areas: review file information on NPL candidate sites, advise the Region in preparing the HRS package for submittal to EPA, perform preliminary review of the draft HRS package, and give advice as to the options for revising the package, including any changes in approach that require immediate attention. The cost of these trips shall be charged site-specifically. Upon return from a Regional trip, the contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the trip. The report shall include any issues that need to be resolved by EPA Headquarters in order to enable the Region to proceed with preparation or revision of the HRS documentation record package.

Assumptions:

Ten trips needing technical assistance during each year of contract performance which will include visits to 4 locations. For estimation purposes, assume the following technical assistance trips:

- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 2 for 3 days
- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 5 for 2 days.

Should the support involve a site visit with potential review of the contaminated area, the contractor shall comply with the Eight-Hour OSHA training requirements, per 29 CFR 1910.120 Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) Training. OSHA defines this as an eight-hour refresher course. In addition, to ensure adequate protection, the contractor shall consult with Regional personnel to inquire about any possible risks posed at the site.

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls and Other General Technical Assistance Support:

Technical support could also include review of site investigations or sampling plans or participation in site screening discussions. Such support does not necessarily require a trip to the Region. Discussion of technical review and consultation can be achieved through conference calls and review of written materials. The contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the conference call.

TASK 3: Meetings and Consultation with SARD Branch

The contractor shall support EPA as follows:

Subtask 1- Status Meeting: As directed by the EPA WAM, the contractor shall attend meetings with EPA on the status of NPL Updates at EPA HQ. These meetings will be infrequent (up to 2 per year) since most status updates are easily conducted by phone. However, such meetings may be necessary prior to Federal Register publication. Meetings, as appropriate, shall be held between the contractor's QA team and the HQ RCs. In addition, the designated contractor's

Regional contacts shall contact each of their 10 EPA Regional NPL Coordinators weekly (only if there is any HRS activity in the Region) to provide an update on the status of sites in the Region.

Subtask 2 - Post-Rule QA Site Briefings: Shortly after the publication of each rule, the contractor shall prepare briefings that will help identify potential issues for response to comments as well as common themes that came up in QA. The briefings will include a summary of highlights for all of the sites. For each site the briefings will include some brief site background and discuss QA issues that went unresolved as well as other interesting/controversial QA-type issues. Following submittal of written materials to EPA, the contractor shall deliver the briefings via conference call to EPA HQ and Regions.

The contractor shall use the information collected for purposes of the site briefings to maintain a collection of QA issues and their resolutions, grouped by issues type and including site name, so that they can easily be referenced by EPA. This will include common QA issues that can be applied to other sites or particularly unusual QA issues.

Subtask 3 - Status Report: Each month a report on the status of all sites in QA or technical assistance shall be delivered concurrently to the EPA WAM, HQ RCs, and NPL Coordinators in each region. The report shall be delivered as part of the monthly report.

Subtask 4 – Conference Support: The contractor may be requested to attend conference meetings in support of HRS and NPL work being performed under this-work assignment. Contractor participation/attendance will be requested (via written technical direction) and approved by EPA approximately 16 calendar days prior to the conference. For estimation purposes, the contractor should assume sending one staff member to Denver for 3 days to support this task.

Subtask 5 – Meeting and Workgroup Support:

The contractor shall support OSRTI in developing and preparing for meetings, briefings, workgroups, conferences, etc., at which guidance and related issues are communicated to the site assessment community by EPA. The contractor shall perform activities such as: (1) gather and summarize technical information; (2) analyze technical and related data; (3) prepare technical reports and related materials on activities, operations, problems, and trends; (4) develop presentations and briefings (oral, written, and audiovisual); (5) plan, coordinate, and prepare materials for meetings, workgroups, and conferences; (6) present and demonstrate materials at meetings, workgroups, and conferences; and (7) make available all necessary services, equipment, and materials to supply full audiovisual and graphics capabilities. The contractor shall anticipate support for 2 meetings per year.

TASK 4: Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records

The contractor shall respond to up to six special requests for research and analysis of HRS Documentation Records. The requests are highly variable and may range from 2 hours to 200 hours. This research and analysis may be in response to inquiries from Congress, other government agencies or EPA management. This research and analysis could apply to all sites

proposed under the original and revised HRS and sites that are currently undergoing QA review. The research could, but not always will, begin with a database search for a certain subset of sites and might include research into the HRS documentation records to further narrow down the subset of sites (for example, finding all sites listed based on contaminated sediments). For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate 40 hours of research and analysis per request (total 240 hours).

TASK 5: Streamlined QA of HRS Documentation Records

The contractor shall perform a streamlined QA on HRS Documentation Record packages. This review is designed to address major issues and ensure a supportable score, but not provide some of the QA details needed for more complicated sites. Sites are typically one pathway. Streamlined QA review. EPA will provide guidance for performing the QA for that specific site but will follow generally the format in the attached SOP (Attachment 2).

TASK 6: Analyze HRS Issues

When issues that are not specifically or clearly addressed in existing guidance surface during the contractor's preparation or QA review of an HRS package, the contractor shall notify the WAM regarding a need for additional analysis. The contractor shall prepare an analysis and present the issue to the EPA WAM and the SARD Branch. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for five such analyses during twelve month period. The contractor is responsible for all research and write-up as well as attending meetings or participating in conference calls where the issue is discussed and offering solutions or past experiences from other sites relevant to the case, as appropriate.

The analyses shall be concise and, where applicable, shall provide the following information:

- Considerations affecting a decision.
- Several options for resolving the issue.
- Advantages and disadvantages of different options.
- Recommended approach with rationale for recommendation.
- Estimated percentage of sites affected by issue (if requested by the EPA WAM).

The contractor shall provide electronic copies of draft HRS analysis papers and supporting documentation to the WAM. SARDB will then meet to decide the best way to resolve the issues. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, and/or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest shall participate in the meeting and summarize all discussions. Following each meeting, the contractor shall finalize the resolution of each issue, using EPA's input/recommendation. For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate a total of 50 hours.

TASK 7: Update Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) Values for Particular Substances

During QA review of an HRS documentation record, there may arise a need for the contractor to evaluate and/or update SCDM values for particular substances by reviewing current references

and databases, searching for new data sources, reviewing risk exposure assumptions, reviewing current algorithms and laws, and regulations/rules on benchmark-setting criteria.

For the particular chemical/substance, the contractor shall provide updated values for each associated HRS factor value (e.g., toxicity, mobility) and benchmark values presented in SCDM. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for six SCDM analyses during the contract year.

TASK 8: Maintain Scoring Information

The contractor shall maintain a subset of listing-related data including, but is not limited to: HRS scores, site narratives, listing dates, etc. The contractor shall provide EPA data and analysis support including responding to ad hoc requests for reports and analyses of site characteristics and scoring information from existing electronic data sources and HRS-related documents. For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate up to six queries per year.

The contractor shall provide support for NPL Rule publication. The contractor shall format NPL information for website publication and provide it to the WAM by 9:00 am one day prior to the scheduled NPL rule publication date in the FR. The EPA WAM will give the contractor at least 5 days advance notice of the exact date of NPL rule publication. However, the proposed date of rule publication shall be given to the contractor by EPA at least 4 months in advance. EPA anticipates two rule publications each year (each rule publication consisting of one proposed and one final rule). The contractor shall convert HRS documentation records to PDF format for publication on the Internet. Four days prior to rule publication the contractor shall send the WAM an electronic spreadsheet containing site names, locations, CERCLIS ID #s, HRS scores, federal facility indicators, FDMS docket numbers and NPL status for the sites being proposed and added to the NPL.

Task 9: Other Analysis

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the collection, extraction, analysis and quality assurance of data (for example, site assessment technical information, State and tribal data, etc.) maintained in Agency information systems. These systems include but are not limited to CERCLIS, SCDM, and HRS QuickScore. For estimation purposes, plan on up to three of these analyses per year averaging 200 hours each.

Task 10: Revise the Hazard Ranking System

The contractor shall support OSRTI in revising or modifying the HRS, and support OSRTI in developing alternative ranking systems if EPA believes revisions are necessary. The contractor shall support OSRTI to:

- Develop and/or analyze technical revisions to the HRS;
- Provide technical background studies;
- Support OSRTI in workgroup deliberations as technical experts on the HRS;
- Respond to public comments;
- Develop a legal defense of the revised HRS; and
- Review petition(s) to determine if technical issues are accurate.

For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

Task 11: Superfund Alternative Approach (SAA)

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the implementation of the Superfund Alternative Approach policy and guidance. This support may include technical analysis, support for workgroups, tracking of SAA data or assistance drafting technical guidance. For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

Task 12: Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support

The contractor shall also support OSRTI by performing technical analyses associated with policy development, regulations, and legislative initiatives. Example of issues associated with this support are analyses concerning the role of the NPL; policy options for addressing mega sites via site listing; States' roles within the waste cleanup program, and state cleanup accomplishments; and program performance measures beyond construction completions (e.g., Superfund Alternative Approach). For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

III. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

The deliverables shall be due as stated below. The contractor shall provide the WAM all deliverables and drafts in electronic format only. Electronic files must also be provided upon completion of the work assignment.

| | <u>Deliverable</u> | <u>Due Date</u> |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Task 0: | Work Plan | Within 20 days after receipt of work assignment. |
| | Monthly Progress Report | 15 th of each month. |
| Task 1: | | |
| <u>Subtask 1</u> | QA Letter | Due 20 business days after receipt of HRS package for a one pathway site plus an additional 5 business days for each additional pathway. |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | Teleconference Call Notes | Due within 3 business days following conference call. |
| <u>Subtask 3</u> | Site Packages | Due two weeks prior to the projected Federal Register publication date, as established by the NPL Rule Manager. |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Subtask 4</u> | Documentation Records | Docket submission at least 5 business days prior to NPL rule publication. |
| | Posting to FDMS: | No later than 5 business days prior to rule publication. |
| | Public Information Materials | Will be specified by EPA WAM |
| <u>Subtask 5</u> | Intensive QA | Will be specified by EPA WAM. |
| Task 2: <u>Subtask 1</u> | Technical Assistance Trips | Travel will be tasked by the EPA WAM. The report summarizing the issues discussed on each site shall be due five business days after conclusion of the trip. |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | TA Conference Call Notes | Due within 3 business days following conference call. |
| Task 3: <u>Subtask 1</u> | Status Meeting | Meeting upon request of EPA WAM. |
| | Contact with EPA HQ RCs | Weekly (if HRS packages are being reviewed). |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | Post-Rule HQ Briefings | No later than 12 business days following publication of proposed rules. |
| <u>Subtask 3</u> | Monthly Status Report | Due by the last business day of each month in electronic format. |
| <u>Subtask 4</u> | Conference Support | Will be specified 14 days prior to conference. |
| <u>Subtask 5</u> | Meeting and Workgroup Support | Will be specified by WAM . |
| Task 4: | Research/Analysis of HRS Doc Records | As specified by EPA WAM. Due between 1 and 14 days from start of task depending on complexity of request. |
| Task 5: | Streamlined QA of HRS Doc Records | Will be specified by EPA WAM, but due generally 12 days from start of project, depending on site. |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Task 6: | Analyze HRS Issues | Work will be initiated by EPA WAM. Draft HIRG analyses are due 5 business days after announcement of the date of the HIRG conference call. Records of discussion, including draft resolution, are due 5 business days after the HIRG call. The TM will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final resolution writeups are due 2 business days following receipt of TM comments. |
| Task 7: | Update SCDM value | Work will be initiated when a change in value for a particular chemical causes SCDM values to change. Draft SCDM analyses are due 21 business days after change of value causing SCDM value to change. The WAM will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final SCDM values are due 7 business days following receipt of WAM comments. |
| Task 8: | Scoring Information | Ongoing |
| | Ad hoc NPL data queries | 24 hours unless specified differently by the EPA WAM |
| | Support for NPL rule | Files formatted, Internet-ready and delivered to EPA by 9:00 am one day prior to NPL rule publication |
| | Spreadsheet with site info | Four business days prior to rule publication |
| Task 9: | Ad Hoc Site Assessment Support | Ongoing |
| Task 10: | Revise the HRS | Will be specified by the WAM. |
| Task 11: | Superfund Alternative Approach | Will be specified by the WAM. |
| Task 12: | Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support | Will be specified by the WAM. |

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Software Application Files and Accessibility

Software Application files, if delivered to the Government, shall conform to the requirements

relating to accessibility as detailed to the 1998 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, particularly, but not limited to, § 1194.21 Software applications and operating systems and § 1194.22 Web-based intranet and internet information and applications. See: <http://www.section508.gov/>

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Preferred text format: | MS Word, 8.0 or higher (Office 2003 or higher) |
| Preferred presentation format: | Power Point, Office 2003 or higher |
| Preferred graphics format: | Each graphic is an individual GIF file |
| Preferred portable format: | Adobe Acrobat, version 6.0 |
| Preferred chart format: | MS Excel/Access for tables |

APPENDIX A

EPA Work Assignment Manager (WAM):

Has overall responsibility for monitoring contractor performance on Work assignment; also provides written technical direction.

Task Monitors:

Regional NPL Coordinators: Also known as Regional Technical Contact (in lieu of Regional NPL Coordinator). The Headquarters contractors will interface with the Regional NPL Coordinator and will discuss with them issues regarding the preparation of the HRS Documentation Record packages, site-specific issues or general HRS or site assessment issues.

Headquarters Regional Coordinator: The Headquarters Regional Coordinator is responsible for clarifying policy and guidance issues during preparation of the HRS package. The HQ Regional Coordinator shall serve as the main EPA HQ contact and participate in all discussions regarding sites in their Regions.

R1: David Yogi
R2: Terry Jeng
R3: Robert Myers
R4: Robert Myers
R5: David Yogi
R6: Bob Myers
R7: Bob Myersg
R8: Robert Lausch (Drew)
R9: David Yogi
R10: Bob Myers

Attachment 1

X^{xx} (e.g., 1st, 2nd) QA Review of HRS Scoring Package for Proposal XX

Site Name:

Location:

Site Score:

Number of Pathways:

Region:

Preparer:

Reviewer:

Date:

1.0 Site Description and General Comments

1.1 Site Description

1.2 General Comments

2.0 Cross-Cutting and Source Characterization Issues

3.0 Technical Issues (*by Pathway*)

3.1 Likelihood of Release

3.2 Waste Characteristics

3.3 Targets

4.0 Referencing and Editorial Issues

5.0 Potential Listing Policy Issues

QA GUIDELINES FOR STREAMLINED HRS PACKAGES

Purpose

To speed up the listing process by concentrating on key components of score, and to ensure the review will be adequate to support the listing decision.

Steps

1. Perform a preliminary review of the HRS documentation record, narrative and score sheets to identify the critical or key scoring/policy factors. Ensure minimum partial attribution if needed for key factors.
2. Ensure proper HRS values have been assigned to critical information.
3. Review reference citations and analytical data for the critical or key scoring factors. Identify any key factor concerns to HQ.
4. Perform low level review of entire document once for any glaring errors not associated with critical scoring factors. This includes math calculation errors, internal inconsistencies, and repetitious materials. Check reference list to make sure it matches the references identified in the HRS documentation record.
5. Prepare QA letter.
6. Identify which parts of this review took the most time.

Attachment 3

HRS Documentation Record Information Requiring Support by Documentation and Possible References For Major HRS Pathways

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Site Introduction | | |
| | Address | City Plat Map, tax records, police and fire departments, government records |
| | Center Point for Latitude/Longitude | USGS map, GIS data, TopoZone |
| | History | Company records and documents, Chamber of Commerce, tax records, Sanborn maps, news articles |
| | Information on Site Vicinity | USGS map, Enviromapper |
| Sampling & Analytical Data | | |
| ALL Sampling Data | Sampling Date | Field logbook, chain-of-custody form, sampling trip report |
| | Sample Location | Field logbook, sampling trip report, sample location map |
| | Sample Description | Field logbook, sampling trip report |
| | Sampling Method and Procedures | Program-wide or site-specific field SAP, QAPP, field logbooks, sampling method document |
| EPA/ CLP or Equivalent | Sample Analysis & Quality Control (QC) | CLP Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Data Validation Report |
| | Detection/Quantitation Limits | Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report), CLP Statement of Work (SOW), CLP National Functional Guidelines |
| | Detection/Quantitation Limit Calculations | Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Form 10 (instrument detection limit sheet), Form 13 (preparation log), Form 14 (analysis run log), calculation worksheet |
| | Concentration Adjustment Calculations | EPA fact sheet "Using Qualified Data to Document an Observed Release or Observed Contamination," calculation worksheet |
| | Verification of CLP Analysis | CLP documentation package, sampling trip report |
| EPA/Non-CLP | Sample Analysis Results & QC | Instrument-generated data sheets for sample results, QC data results as required by the method, data validation report, EPA programmatic standard documentation requirements |
| | Method Detection Limit (MDL) or equivalent | Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report) |
| | MDL Calculations | Definition and sample calculation in the data deliverable report; if not MDL, documentation of equivalence |
| | Method/Procedure Used for Analysis | SAP, QAPP, statement of work, data deliverable report, or equivalent |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | Other QC Documentation | Regulatory data from other EPA programs and standard documentation as required by program |
| Other Federal Program | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data above |
| | Other QC Documentation | Regulatory data from other programs and standard documentation reports required by the program |
| State/Non-CLP | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data above SAP, QAPP |
| | Other QC Documentation | State regulatory program data, discharge permit compliance forms, standard documentation as required by State program |
| PRP/Non-CLP equivalent | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data, SAP, QAPP |
| | Other QC Documentation | Administrative Consent Order (ACO) or Agreement on Consent (AOC) and required documentation, statements of data usability |
| Removal Actions | | |
| | Date of Removal Initiation and Completion | EPA Removal reports, RCRA Corrective Action reports, private industry compliance reports, State regulatory reports, aerial photographs |
| | Description of Removal/Containment Action | |
| | Cleanup Criteria | |
| | Confirmatory Sampling | |
| | Contamination/Past Release Remaining | |
| Sources | | |
| | Source Location and Description | Company records, permit applications, visual observations and measurements in field logbooks, aerial photographs, “as built” drawings, MSDS forms, company products lists, TRI and other EPA regulatory databases, NPDES permit applications and compliance reports, air permits, sampling trip reports (same as PA/SI and other sampling events), State records, Sanborn maps, Enviromapper |
| | Source Type | |
| | Containment Features | |
| | Associated Substances by | |
| | Sampling | |
| | Manifest | |
| | Discharges | |
| | Waste Quantity | |
| | Estimation Method | |
| Reproducible Measurements | | |
| Ground Water Pathway | | |
| Aquifer Description | | |
| | Strata | Topographic and geologic maps and cross sections, USGS and State survey studies, well logs, sampling reports, pump test reports, State well databases, sampling trip reports |
| | Aquifers | |
| | Confining Layers/Interconnections | |
| | Discontinuities | |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---|--|--|
| | Flow Direction | Field logbooks, sampling trip reports, test pits, local geologic maps indicating the dips, strikes, and faults, topographic maps if ground water flow follows topography, previously assembled local potentiometric gradient documentation |
| | Ground Water Use | USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State well databases, local water purveyors and drillers, well surveys, site reconnaissance logbooks |
| Likelihood of Release | | |
| Observed Release by Direct Observation | Depth to Ground Water | Well logs, test pits, sampling trip reports/logbooks |
| | Depth of Contamination | Test pits, soil borings, source descriptions in regulatory documents/PRP reports, engineering plans, disposal records |
| Observed Release by Chemical Analysis | Well Type (public, private, monitoring) | Water resources reports, water utilities, sampling trip reports, water purveyors and drillers, well permits, State and county water databases |
| | Well Depth | |
| | Aquifer Tapped | |
| | Well Development (conventional, direct push) | |
| | Sample Similarity | Sampling and analysis plans and reports, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, sample filtering information |
| | Sample Preparation | |
| | Attribution | |
| | Association with Source | See Sources information |
| | Other Possible Sources/Sites | Enviromapper, Federal and State regulatory databases, Sanborn maps, Phase I site assessment studies |
| Targets | | |
| Target Detection Limit (TDL) | TDL delineation | Source boundary information, USGS maps, GIS |
| | Wells per Distance Category | State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, site reconnaissance logbooks |
| | Well Location | USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, site reconnaissance logbooks, sampling trip reports |
| | Level of Contamination | Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) benchmarks |
| Population | Residents | |
| | Count per household | U.S. Census, field logbooks, interviews, access permission forms, water utilities |
| | Apportionment | Water utilities |
| | Workers | Interviews, Chamber of Commerce |
| | Closed Wells | Government closure document, water utility, public health department |
| | Date of Closure | |
| | Rationale | |
| | Sample at Closure | Sample reports |
| | Targets at Closure | See Residents under Population above |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|--|---|---|
| Other Targets | Wellhead Protection Area | State government agencies and laws and regulations, delineation maps |
| | Resources | State and Federal water resources programs and studies, water purveyors, county and local water utilities |
| Surface Water Pathway | | |
| Likelihood of Release | | |
| Observed Release by Direct Observation | Discharge or Spill | Interviews, affidavits, visual observations, photographs, field logbook, permit violations, other recorded violations, TDL map, sample location map, County records, flood zone maps, stream gauge records, News media reports of spills and floods |
| | Water Body Boundaries | |
| | Source Sample Location & Depth | |
| | Flood (including date and boundaries) | |
| Observed Release by Chemical Analysis | Sample Locations | Sampling plan, field logbooks, sample maps, USGS maps, sampling trip reports, laboratory analysis sheets with percent organic information |
| | Sample Type (water, sediment, fish tissue) | |
| | Sample Descriptions | |
| | Sample Similarity | |
| | Attribution | |
| | Association with Sources | See Sources section |
| | Other Possible Sources | Windshield survey, Enviromapper, EPA and State regulatory databases, CERCLIS, site historical information |
| Waste Characteristics | | |
| | Salinity | Analytical results, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, topographic map, field logbook, field biologist |
| | Water Body Type | |
| Targets | | |
| | Zones of Contamination by Threat | Sample location map, TDL map, USGS maps |
| Drinking Water Threat | Intakes | Public water utility, intake location map, USGS/water resources stream flow data, field logbook, State databases |
| | Location | |
| | Stream Flow at Intakes | |
| | Population Served including Date and Apportionment) | |
| Human Food Chain Threat | Fisheries | U.S. and State fish and wildlife programs, observations in field logbook, State fisheries programs, interviews, State and local tourist agencies |
| | Human Consumption | |
| | Fishing Locations | |
| | Catch data | |
| | Closed Fisheries | State official closure notice, State database |
| Sensitive Environments | Listed Environments | U.S. Fish and Wildlife/State wildlife biologist, National Heritage Program data, Federal and State authorizing legislation, Federal Register, State maps and brochures |
| | Specific Targets | |
| | Habitat Range | |
| | Location/Boundaries | |
| | Official Designation | |
| | Wetlands | National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, wetland specialist, State and Federal GIS databases |
| | NWI Designation | |
| Measurements | | |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s)^a |
|--|--|--|
| Resources | Resources | Enviromapper, topographic map, windshield survey, public water authority, State and county offices (e.g., health department, land use office), Chamber of Commerce |
| Soil Exposure Pathway, Resident Population Threat | | |
| Observed Contamination | | |
| | Contaminated Soil: Background and Release | Sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, site history, soil survey, sample location map |
| | Sample locations | |
| | Sample depth | |
| | Sample similarity | |
| | Interference Rationale | Information on mode of deposition |
| | Other Sources | Site history, sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, survey sample location map, topographic map |
| | Sample Location | |
| | Sample Depth | |
| | Source Boundary | |
| | Attribution | See Surface Water Pathway suggestions |
| Waste Quantity | | |
| | Source Type | Site history, field logbook, survey, affidavits, manifests |
| | Calculations | Field logbook, survey, affidavits, field logbook, topographic map, sample location map, measuring instruments with worksheets |
| Targets | | |
| | Residents | Field logbook, sample location map, sampling and analysis plan, plat maps, House by House survey (actual count), U.S. Census Bureau Web site |
| | On Property and within 200 feet | |
| | Population per household | |
| | Students | Topographic map, sample location map, board of education, survey/interview with school management staff (actual count) |
| | School Location | |
| | Number of Students | |
| | Workers | Topographic map, sample location map, field logbook, survey (actual count), facility records, Chamber of Commerce |
| | Location | |
| | Number | |
| | Level of Contamination | Sample analytical result, HRS/SCDM benchmark |
| | Sensitive Environments | U.S. Fish and Wildlife, USDA Forest Service, National Park Service NWI map, sample location map, field biologist, field logbook |
| | Official Designation | |
| | Location | |
| | Habitat Range | |

^a Whenever secondary references are cited (e.g., most sample investigation reports), the scoring information should be further supported by a primary reference (e.g., field logbooks). See the *Regional QC Guidance Manual* (EPA Publication 9345.1-08, December 1991), Section 2.4.1, p. 16, for examples of primary versus secondary reference sources.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | | | | | Work Assignment Number 2-01 | | | | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number: 000002 | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-016 | | | Contract Period 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name | | | | |
| | | | Base <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option Period Number | | | Support for NPL Updates | | | | |
| Contractor COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION | | | | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW | | | | | |
| Purpose: | | | | | Period of Performance | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | | | | From 08/01/2012 To 07/31/2013 | | | | | |
| Comments: The purpose of this action is to add 1500 hours of Level of Effort to this Work Assignment. There is no change in scope to the statement of work, only an addition of more time. The contractor should prepare a very brief work plan and cost estimate in accordance with the terms of the contract. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund Accounting and Appropriations Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SFO <input type="checkbox"/> (Max 2) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period: | | Cost/Fee: | | | | LOE: 0 | | | | |
| 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| This Action: | | | | | | 18,920 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 18,920 | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | LOE: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cumulative Approved: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | LOE: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name David Yogi | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Phone Number 703-347-8835 | | | | |
| | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | | |
| Project Officer Name Emily Johnson | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Phone Number: 703-603-8764 | | | | |
| | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | | |
| Other Agency Official Name | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Phone Number: | | | | |
| | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | | |
| Contracting Official Name Eulvid Rocque | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Phone Number: 202-564-8316 | | | | |
| | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | | |

Work Assignment Form, (WebForms v1.0)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | | | | | Work Assignment Number 2-01 | | | | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number: 000004 | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-016 | | | Contract Period 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name | | | | |
| | | | Base Option Period Number 1 | | | 2-01 NPL Updates | | | | |
| Contractor COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION | | | | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW | | | | | |
| Purpose: <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | | | | Period of Performance From 08/01/2012 To 07/31/2014 | | | | | |
| Comments: The purpose of this amendment is to extend the period of performance, amend the Statement of Work, increase the level of effort, and request a work plan and cost estimate in accordance with the terms of the contract. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund Accounting and Appropriations Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SFO (Max 2) 22 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period: | | Cost/Fee: | | | | LOE: 0 | | | | |
| 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| This Action: | | | | | | 36,420 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 36,420 | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cumulative Approved: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name David Yogi | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number 703-347-8835 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |
| Project Officer Name Emily Johnson | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number: 703-603-8764 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |
| Other Agency Official Name | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number: | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |
| Contracting Official Name Eric Schermerhorn | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | | |
| _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | | Phone Number: 202-564-6095 | | | |
| | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | | |

Performance Work Statement

Work Assignment Number: 2-01

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Title: Support for National Priorities List (NPL) Updates

B. Work Assignment Manager: Terry Jeng
US EPA
OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8852, Fax (703) 603-9112
email: jeng.terry@epa.gov

Alternate Work Assignment Manager: Robert Myers
US EPA
OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8851, Fax (703) 603-9112
email: myers.robert@epa.gov

C. OBJECTIVE

This work assignment provides technical support to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Agency's technical review of sites that are candidates for the NPL updates under the revised Hazard Ranking System (HRS). The purpose of the technical review, known as the Quality Assurance (QA) review, is to ensure that the technical basis used to support a site listing decision is consistent with the revised HRS rule as defined in the December 14, 1990 Federal Register, as well as EPA's technical guidance.

This work assignment also supports other HRS and NPL rulemaking activities. This includes NPL site characteristic information and tracking, web posting and Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) support.

D. BACKGROUND

Federal responsibility for the assessment and cleanup of sites contaminated by hazardous wastes resides with the U.S. EPA under the authority of several statutes, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI), is one of EPA's primary offices for implementation of CERCLA.

CERCLA enacted in 1980, and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), provides the Federal Government broad authority for responding to the dangers posed by uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The EPA

responded by developing the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which is a scoring system used to establish the National Priorities List (NPL). On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA revised the HRS, as required by SARA. The revised HRS became effective on March 14, 1991. The HRS is the primary mechanism used to add sites to the NPL.

The Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch (SARDB) in OSRTI is responsible for discovering sites, evaluating their potential threat to human health and the environment, implementing the HRS, proposing and adding them to the NPL and maintaining public information regarding these activities via the web and other OSRTI data systems. A key component of implementing the HRS is evaluating exposure pathways, including surface and groundwater contamination.

This Performance Work Statement is to be used as a notice of a continuation of work currently being performed by CSC under EPA contract # EP-W-10-016.

E. Quality Assurance:

The tasks in this assignment require the use of secondary data. Collection, use and analysis of data will be governed by procedures described in the quality assurance project plan (QAPP) and consistent with the Agency's quality assurance (QA) requirements. The project specific quality assurance requirements must be addressed in the monthly progress reports.

II. TASK DETAIL

The contractor shall perform the following tasks:

Task 0 – Work Plan and Budget Development

The contractor shall prepare a detailed work plan and budget for the accomplishment of the indicated tasks in accordance with the clause *Work Assignments* (EPAAR 1552.211-74), Alternate I. The work plan shall include cost estimates a description of: (a) proposed staff; (b) the number of hours and labor classifications proposed for each task, to include both prime contractor and subcontractor labor; and (c) a list of deliverables, with due dates and schedule for deliverables. This task also includes weekly telephone conferences between the WAM and the project manager, to coordinate and confirm task performance. The contractor shall also submit monthly progress and financial reports pursuant clause, F.2, MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT (EPAAR 211-70)

Prior to initiating any action under technical direction, the EPA WAM shall ensure that the technical direction falls within the scope of work for this Work Assignment. The contractor shall charge and track time site-specifically whenever applicable. With a few exceptions where general support is given, most of the work under Task 1 (QA) and Task 3 (Technical Assistance) should be charged to specific sites. Site Spill Identifier (SSID) numbers used for tracking the sites shall be provided to the contractor by EPA for the purpose of site-specific charging.

Task 1: QA Review

EPA HQ will provide the contractor with a list of sites that have been approved by EPA management to go forward for QA review, and the EPA will provide the contractor with the site

HRS documentation records and associated references (hard and/or electronic copies). The contractor shall assign contractor Regional Coordinators (RCs), who will serve as the points of contact for QA issues with the respective EPA HQ RCs and the Regional NPL Coordinators. Task 1 will consist of the following components:

1) QA Review

Upon receipt, the contractor shall review each HRS package to ensure that the HRS is properly and consistently applied and identify data gaps to help assure that the site scoring approach has the best chance of meeting legal challenges. Based on the litigation potential, complexity of the site scoring approach or other factors, the EPA WAM will identify the level of QA review to be performed on each HRS package. Unless otherwise specified by the EPA WAM or EPA HQ RC, all levels of QA review will include a documentation completeness check, qualitative reference check, mathematical/assigned values check, issue identification and qualitative analytical data documentation check. The EPA WAM will identify in writing to the contractor WAM the sites for which QA review shall be initiated and the level of QA review that each site is to receive. The contractor shall identify the level of QA review conducted in the QA letters and monthly progress and status reports. The levels of QA review are:

- Full or Standard QA Review – The full QA review will consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, and a review of all assertions made in HRS documentation records, all calculated and assigned values and all reference citations supporting those assertions and values. The proportion of time spent during the QA review will reflect the relative importance of the pathways and/or factors. The time taken to review portions of the package not contributing significantly to the overall site score will be a small fraction of the time taken to review the significant portions of the site package.
- Streamlined QA Review - This review is designed to address major issues and ensure a supportable score, but not provide some of the QA details needed for more complicated sites. Sites are typically one pathway. The EPA will provide guidance for performing the QA for that specific site, which will generally follow the below format:
 - Perform a preliminary review of the HRS documentation record, narrative and score sheets to identify the critical or key scoring/policy factors. Ensure minimum partial attribution if needed for key factors.
 - Ensure proper HRS values have been assigned to critical information.
 - Review reference citations and analytical data for the critical or key scoring factors. Identify any key factor concerns to HQ.
 - Perform low level review of entire document once for any glaring errors not associated with critical scoring factors. This includes math calculation errors, internal inconsistencies, and repetitious materials. Check reference list to make sure it matches the references identified in the HRS documentation record.
 - Prepare QA letter.
 - Identify which parts of this review took the most time.

- Abbreviated QA Review – The abbreviated QA review will consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, which will include identification of technical, policy and HRS scoring and application issues. The primary distinction between the abbreviated QA review and full QA review is that no reference citations will be verified during the abbreviated QA review and, typically, there will be only one round of review on an HRS package and one final summation of any issues not resolved by the Region in the final submission.
- Intensive QA Review – Under certain cases where the EPA perceives a high risk of litigation regarding a site, the EPA may task the contractor to perform one or more of the following assignments:
 - Review Sampling Documentation and Procedures
 - Review sampling logbooks and primary sampling reports (e.g., expanded site inspections [ESIs], remedial investigations/feasibility studies [RI/FSs], etc.) from cover to cover to ensure that documentation is accurate and consistent for key samples and key sample locations, and that sample location maps are consistent with sample location descriptions.
 - Review whether field standard operating procedures (SOPs) for collection of critical samples were documented in the HRS package and whether, based on information presented in the HRS package (e.g., logbooks, primary sampling reports), SOPs were followed. Request sampling SOPs and sample plans from the Regions, as needed.
 - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that samples are consistently identified (or adequate information is provided to crosswalk sample ID numbers definitively).
 - Review Data Quality
 - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that holding times were met. Review sample handling procedures and sample preservation and identify field duplicates.
 - Evaluate whether adequate quality control (QC) samples (field blanks, duplicates, etc.) were collected.
 - Review laboratory reports and/or data validation reports and procedures to identify deviations from laboratory QC guidelines. In cases where deviations from sample handling procedures or laboratory QC guidelines are apparent, review whether either: 1) deviations are accounted for through data validation; or 2) adequate information is provided in the HRS package to validate the data, if necessary. Review whether analytical data are adjusted according to HRS policy.
 - Ensure Package Integrity
 - Examine information included in references with the HRS package but not used in scoring to identify issues that could be raised during response to public comments or that could contradict the scoring strategy.

- Ensure that documentation included in the HRS package (e.g., maps, field logbooks) is adequate to characterize and/or rule out contributions from other potential sources in the area.

If at any time during QA review issues are identified that could cause the site score to drop below 28.50 using the HRS, the contractor shall promptly alert EPA HQ.

2) QA Letter

After completing QA review on an HRS site package submission, the contractor shall prepare a QA letter. If major issues arise, the contractor shall discuss them with the Regional NPL Coordinator and the EPA HQ RC prior to submittal of the QA letter. The purpose of the QA letter is to provide EPA HQ and the Region with written comments on problems or weaknesses in HRS documentation records and, as appropriate and according to the level of QA review, the reference packages. These letters will be comprehensive, such that once all problems cited in the letter are addressed, the site package will be ready to pass QA (in absence of new QA issues). Upon completion, the contractor shall send each QA letter concurrently to the EPA WAM, appropriate EPA HQ RC (who serves as task monitor) and the appropriate EPA NPL Coordinator in the Region, unless otherwise instructed. The Regional NPL Coordinator will then make the necessary changes to the HRS package and resubmit the revised HRS package to the contractor. When time permits during a scheduled NPL update and depending on the level of QA review selected, there may be several rounds of QA letters and full or partial HRS package resubmissions. After all issues are addressed to the extent feasible by the Region and primarily editorial comments remain, the contractor shall provide the EPA WAM and the Region with a redlined version of the HRS documentation record showing any remaining proposed corrections. Once the Region has reviewed and accepted these corrections, the EPA WAM will notify the contractor, who will make these corrections, producing a final version of the HRS documentation record. The contractor shall follow the format of the QA letter provided by the EPA in Attachment #1.

3) Conference Calls

Following issuance of QA letter, the contractor shall have their Regional Coordinator and QA reviewers participate in conference calls when necessary with the EPA WAM, EPA HQ and the Regions to clarify issues and discuss areas of disagreement. The frequency of the conference calls shall be based on the need. This frequency will vary by Region and number of packages undergoing QA (Approximately 30 packages undergo QA per year). The contractor's Regional Coordinator and appropriate technical staff shall be responsible for reviewing site packages and discussing QA issues during the conference call. These same staff people shall have responsibility for reviewing the same site packages during any subsequent formal QA of the site package that takes place. The contractor shall provide the HQ RC, the NPL coordinator in the Region and the EPA WAM with conference call notes (telecons) summarizing any action items and decisions within 3 business days following the call.

TASK 2: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Subtask 1 - Trips to Regions: The contractor shall travel to the Region in response to special requests for pre-HRS and HRS technical support. These requests will be relayed to the contractor by the EPA WAM through written technical direction. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest to the Region, shall provide the Region with technical support in the following areas: review file information on NPL candidate sites, advise the Region in preparing the HRS package for submittal to EPA, perform preliminary review of the draft HRS package, and give advice as to the options for revising the package, including any changes in approach that require immediate attention. The cost of these trips shall be charged site-specifically. Upon return from a Regional trip, the contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the trip. The report shall include any issues that need to be resolved by EPA Headquarters in order to enable the Region to proceed with preparation or revision of the HRS documentation record package.

Assumptions:

Three trips needing technical assistance during each year of contract performance which will include visits to 2 locations. For estimation purposes, assume the following technical assistance trips:

- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 2 for 3 days
- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 5 for 2 days.

Should the support involve a site visit with potential review of the contaminated area, the contractor shall comply with the Eight-Hour OSHA training requirements, per 29 CFR 1910.120 Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) Training. OSHA defines this as an eight-hour refresher course. In addition, to ensure adequate protection, the contractor shall consult with Regional personnel to inquire about any possible risks posed at the site.

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls and Other General Technical Assistance Support:

Technical support could also include review of site investigations or sampling plans or participation in site screening discussions. Such support does not necessarily require a trip to the Region. Discussion of technical review and consultation can be achieved through conference calls and review of written materials. The contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the conference call. The EPA WAM will inform the contractor which sites have been approved for technical assistance.

TASK 3: Meetings and Consultation with SARD Branch

The contractor shall support EPA as follows:

Subtask 1- Status Meeting: As directed by the EPA WAM, the contractor shall attend meetings with EPA on the status of NPL Updates at EPA HQ. These meetings will be infrequent (up to 2 per year) since most status updates are easily conducted by phone. However, such meetings may

be necessary prior to Federal Register publication. Meetings, as appropriate, shall be held between the contractor's QA team and the HQ RCs. In addition, the designated contractor's Regional contacts shall contact each of their 10 EPA Regional NPL Coordinators weekly (only if there is any HRS activity in the Region) to provide an update on the status of sites in the Region.

Subtask 2 - Post-Rule QA Site Briefings: If determined necessary by EPA WAM and requested via TDD, shortly after rule publication, the contractor shall prepare briefings that will help identify potential issues for response to comments as well as common themes that came up in QA. The briefings will include a summary of highlights for all of the sites. For each site, the briefings will include some brief site background and discuss QA issues that went unresolved as well as other interesting/controversial QA-type issues. Following submittal of written materials to EPA, the contractor shall deliver the briefings via conference call to EPA HQ and Regions.

The contractor shall use the information collected for purposes of the site briefings to maintain a collection of QA issues and their resolutions, grouped by issues type and including site name, so that they can easily be referenced by EPA. This will include common QA issues that can be applied to other sites or particularly unusual QA issues.

Subtask 3 - Status Report: Each month a report on the status of all sites in QA or technical assistance shall be delivered concurrently to the EPA WAM, HQ RCs, and NPL Coordinators in each region. The report shall be delivered as part of the monthly report.

Subtask 4 – Conference Support: The contractor may be requested to attend conference meetings in support of HRS and NPL work being performed under this-work assignment. Contractor participation/attendance will be requested (via written technical direction) and approved by EPA approximately 16 calendar days prior to the conference. For estimation purposes, the contractor should assume sending one staff member to Denver for 3 days to support this task.

Subtask 5 – Meeting and Workgroup Support:

The contractor shall support OSRTI in developing and preparing for meetings, briefings, workgroups, conferences, etc., at which guidance and related issues are communicated to the site assessment community by EPA. The contractor shall perform activities such as: (1) gather and summarize technical information; (2) analyze technical and related data; (3) prepare technical reports and related materials on activities, operations, problems, and trends; (4) develop presentations and briefings (oral, written, and audiovisual); (5) plan, coordinate, and prepare materials for meetings, workgroups, and conferences; (6) present and demonstrate materials at meetings, workgroups, and conferences; and (7) make available all necessary services, equipment, and materials to supply full audiovisual and graphics capabilities. The contractor shall anticipate support for 1 meeting per year.

TASK 4: Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records

The contractor shall respond to up to two special requests for research and analysis of HRS Documentation Records. The requests are highly variable and may range from 2 hours to 200

hours. This research and analysis may be in response to inquiries from Congress, other government agencies or EPA management. This research and analysis could apply to all sites proposed under the original and revised HRS and sites that are currently undergoing QA review. The research could, but not always will, begin with a database search for a certain subset of sites and might include research into the HRS documentation records to further narrow down the subset of sites (for example, finding all sites listed based on contaminated sediments). For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate 40 hours of research and analysis per request (total 80 hours).

TASK 5 - Support for NPL Rule Publication and Scoring Information:

The contractor shall support activities related to NPL proposed and final rule publication. These activities will consist of the following components for each NPL rulemaking:

- 1) Reviewing, formatting and creating PDFs with 508 compliance the narrative summaries for each site.
- 2) Delivering electronic versions of the HRS documentation records, supporting documentation and any other necessary associated documents.
- 3) Filling in names and addresses on congressional notification letters using an EPA-provided MS Word template. The contractor shall verify congressional district and verify senator and representative names on the house.gov and senate.gov websites. Contractor shall deliver letters and associated mailing labels electronically to EPA WAM via email.
- 4) For each final rule, the contractor shall compile all support documents into PDF files; files shall be paginated and meet agency requirements. The contractor shall prepare the title page, abstract, contents, executive summary, introduction, and glossary for the PDF files. The PDF files shall be delivered by email concurrently to the EPA WAM for posting on the web along with the other NPL rule information, and to the EPA WAM.
- 5) On an as-needed basis, preparing any necessary public information documents and background information. This shall be tasked via TD by the EPA WAM.

The contractor shall post these documents plus state concurrence letters (provided by the EPA WAM) to the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) no later than 5 business days prior to FR publication (with the exception of last minute changes to documents by EPA).

The contractor shall prepare NPL listing information (including state correspondence documents) for website publication and provide it to the WAM and OSRTI web change request mailbox by 9:00 am at least one day prior to the issuance of the EPA press release (which generally occurs 2 days prior to FR publication date). The EPA WAM will give the contractor at least 5 days advance notice of the exact date of NPL rule publication. However, the projected date of rule publication shall be given to the contractor by EPA at least 4 months in advance. EPA anticipates two rule publications each year (each rule publication consisting of one proposed and

one final rule). The contractor shall convert HRS documentation records to PDF format for publication on the Internet.

Four days prior to rule publication the contractor shall send the WAM an electronic spreadsheet containing site names, locations, CERCLIS ID #s, HRS scores, federal facility indicators, FDMS docket numbers and NPL status for the sites being proposed and added to the NPL.

Maintain Scoring Information

The contractor shall maintain a subset of listing-related data including, but not limited to: HRS scores, site narratives, listing dates, etc. The contractor shall provide EPA data and analysis support including responding to ad hoc requests for reports and analyses of site characteristics and scoring information from existing electronic data sources and HRS-related documents. For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate up to six queries per year.

TASK 6: Analyze HRS Issues

When issues that are not specifically or clearly addressed in existing guidance surface during the contractor's preparation or QA review of an HRS package, the contractor shall notify the WAM regarding a need for additional analysis. The contractor shall prepare an analysis and present the issue to the EPA WAM and the SARD Branch. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for five such analyses during twelve month period. The contractor is responsible for all research and write-up as well as attending meetings or participating in conference calls where the issue is discussed and offering solutions or past experiences from other sites relevant to the case, as appropriate.

The analyses shall be concise and, where applicable, shall provide the following information:

- Considerations affecting a decision.
- Several options for resolving the issue.
- Advantages and disadvantages of different options.
- Recommended approach with rationale for recommendation.
- Estimated percentage of sites affected by issue (if requested by the EPA WAM).

The contractor shall provide electronic copies of draft HRS analysis papers and supporting documentation to the WAM. SARDB will then meet to decide the best way to resolve the issues. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, and/or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest shall participate in the meeting and summarize all discussions. Following each meeting, the contractor shall finalize the resolution of each issue, using EPA's input/recommendation. For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate a total of 80 hours.

TASK 7: Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) – Updating Values for Particular Substances and Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool

During QA review of an HRS documentation record, there may arise a need for the contractor to evaluate and/or update SCDM values for particular substances by reviewing current references and databases, searching for new data sources, reviewing risk exposure assumptions, reviewing current algorithms and laws, and regulations/rules on benchmark-setting criteria.

For the particular chemical/substance, the contractor shall provide updated values for each associated HRS factor value (e.g., toxicity, mobility) and benchmark values presented in SCDM. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for six SCDM analyses during the contract year.

Further, the contractor shall provide maintenance support for the SCDM Data Management Tool previously developed, and update the tool in the future as necessary. This will involve following up and finalizing the SCDM benchmark revisions and implementing the data management tool. The contractor shall anticipate the need for user support and tool refinements during the early months of implementation, as normal for initial startup after database development.

The contractor shall continue to support EPA in the final revision effort of the SCDM benchmarks. This may include follow up discussions with EPA to answer questions and incorporating changes before the values and methodology are finalized. Once values are updated and incorporated into the SCDM data management tool, the contractor shall provide reports to replace those currently posted on the SCDM website. The contractor shall also coordinate with HRS site scorers, QuickScore developers, and/or EPA developers of Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) and Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) regarding the updated SCDM values.

Task 8: Other Analysis

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the collection, extraction, analysis and quality assurance of data (for example, site assessment technical information, State and tribal data, etc.) maintained in Agency information systems. These systems include but are not limited to CERCLIS, SCDM, and HRS QuickScore. For estimation purposes, plan on one analysis per year averaging 100 hours each.

Task 9: Superfund Alternative Approach (SAA)

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the implementation of the Superfund Alternative Approach policy and guidance. This support may include technical analysis, support for workgroups, tracking of SAA data or assistance drafting technical guidance. For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 100 hours per year.

Task 10: Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support

The contractor shall also support OSRTI by performing technical analyses associated with policy development, regulations, and legislative initiatives. Example of issues associated with this support are analyses concerning the role of the NPL; policy options for addressing mega sites via site listing; States' roles within the waste cleanup program, and state cleanup accomplishments; and program performance measures beyond construction completions (e.g., Superfund

Alternative Approach). For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

III. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

The deliverables shall be due as stated below. The contractor shall provide the WAM all deliverables and drafts in electronic format only. Electronic files must also be provided upon completion of the work assignment.

| | <u>Deliverable</u> | <u>Due Date</u> |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Task 0: | Work Plan | Within 20 days after receipt of work assignment. |
| | Monthly Progress Report | 15 th of each month. |
| Task 1: | | |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | QA Letter | Due 20 business days after receipt of HRS package for a one pathway site plus an additional 5 business days for each additional pathway, or as determined by the EPA WAM. |
| <u>Subtask 3</u> | Teleconference Call Notes | Due within 3 business days following conference call. |
| Task 2: | | |
| <u>Subtask 1</u> | Technical Assistance Trips | Travel will be tasked by the EPA WAM. The report summarizing the issues discussed on each site shall be due five business days after conclusion of the trip. |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | TA Conference Call Notes | Due within 3 business days following conference call. |
| Task 3: | | |
| <u>Subtask 1</u> | Status Meeting | Meeting upon request of EPA WAM. |
| | Contact with EPA HQ RCs | Weekly (if HRS packages are being reviewed). |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | Post-Rule HQ Briefings | No later than 12 business days following publication of proposed rules (if tasked by WAM). |

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| <u>Subtask 3</u> | Monthly Status Report | Due by the last business day of each month in electronic format. |
| <u>Subtask 4</u> | Conference Support | Will be specified 14 days prior to conference. |
| <u>Subtask 5</u> | Meeting and Workgroup Support | Will be specified by WAM . |
| Task 4: | Research/Analysis of HRS Doc Records | As specified by EPA WAM. Due between 1 and 14 days from start of task depending on complexity of request. |
| Task 5: | Ad hoc NPL data queries | 24 hours unless specified differently by EPA WAM |
| | Support for NPL rule | Files formatted, Internet-ready and delivered to EPA by 9:00 am one day prior to NPL rule publication |
| | Spreadsheet with site info | Four business days prior to rule publication |
| | Site Packages | Due two weeks prior to the projected Federal Register publication date, as established by the NPL Rule Manager. |
| | Documentation Records And Support Documents | Docket submission at least 5 business days prior to NPL rule publication. |
| | Posting to FDMS: | No later than 5 business days prior to rule publication unless otherwise directed by EPA WAM |
| | Public Information Materials | Will be specified by EPA WAM |
| Task 6: | Analyze HRS Issues | Work will be initiated by EPA WAM. Draft HRS issues analyses are due 4 business prior to discussion call with EPA. Records of discussion, including draft resolution, are due 5 business days after the discussion conference call. The WAM or task monitor will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final resolution writeups are due 2 business days following receipt of WAM or task monitor comments. |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Task 7: | Update SCDM value | Work will be initiated when a change in value for a particular chemical causes SCDM values to change. Draft SCDM analyses are due 21 business days after change of value causing SCDM value to change. The WAM will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final SCDM values are due 7 business days following receipt of WAM comments. |
| | Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool | Deliverable due dates will be negotiated with contractor prior to start of work either verbally or via TD, issued by either WAM or alternate. |
| Task 8: | Other analysis | Will be specified by EPA WAM. |
| Task 9: | Superfund Alternative Approach | Will be specified by EPA WAM. |
| Task 10: | Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support | Will be specified by the WAM. |

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Software Application Files and Accessibility

Software Application files, if delivered to the Government, shall conform to the requirements relating to accessibility as detailed to the 1998 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, particularly, but not limited to, § 1194.21 Software applications and operating systems and § 1194.22 Web-based intranet and internet information and applications. See: <http://www.section508.gov/>

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Preferred text format: | MS Word, 2007 or higher (Office 2007 or higher) |
| Preferred presentation format: | Power Point, Office 2007 or higher |
| Preferred graphics format: | Each graphic is an individual GIF file |
| Preferred portable format: | Adobe Acrobat, version X |
| Preferred chart format: | MS Excel/Access for tables |

APPENDIX A

EPA Work Assignment Manager (WAM):

Has overall responsibility for monitoring contractor performance on Work assignment; also provides written technical direction.

Task Monitors:

Regional NPL Coordinators: Also known as Regional Technical Contact (in lieu of Regional NPL Coordinator). The Headquarters contractors will interface with the Regional NPL Coordinator and will discuss with them issues regarding the preparation of the HRS Documentation Record packages, site-specific issues or general HRS or site assessment issues.

Headquarters Regional Coordinator: The Headquarters Regional Coordinator is responsible for clarifying policy and guidance issues during preparation of the HRS package. The HQ Regional Coordinator shall serve as the main EPA HQ contact and participate in all discussions regarding sites in their Regions.

R1: Terry Jeng
R2: Terry Jeng
R3: Terry Jeng
R4: Robert Myers
R5: Robert Myers
R6: Terry Jeng
R7: Robert Myers
R8: Robert Lausch (Drew)
R9: Robert Myers
R10: Robert Myers

Attachment 1

X^{xx} (e.g., 1st, 2nd) QA Review of HRS Scoring Package for Proposal XX

Site Name:

Location:

Site Score:

Number of Pathways:

Region:

Preparer:

Reviewer:

Date:

1.0 Site Description and General Comments

1.1 Site Description

1.2 General Comments

2.0 Cross-Cutting and Source Characterization Issues

3.0 Technical Issues (*by Pathway*)

3.1 Likelihood of Release

3.2 Waste Characteristics

3.3 Targets

4.0 Referencing and Editorial Issues

5.0 Potential Listing Policy Issues

Attachment 2

HRS Documentation Record Information Requiring Support by Documentation and Possible References For Major HRS Pathways

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Site Introduction | | |
| | Address | City Plat Map, tax records, police and fire departments, government records |
| | Center Point for Latitude/Longitude | USGS map, GIS data, TopoZone |
| | History | Company records and documents, Chamber of Commerce, tax records, Sanborn maps, news articles |
| | Information on Site Vicinity | USGS map, Enviromapper |
| Sampling & Analytical Data | | |
| ALL Sampling Data | Sampling Date | Field logbook, chain-of-custody form, sampling trip report |
| | Sample Location | Field logbook, sampling trip report, sample location map |
| | Sample Description | Field logbook, sampling trip report |
| | Sampling Method and Procedures | Program-wide or site-specific field SAP, QAPP, field logbooks, sampling method document |
| EPA/ CLP or Equivalent | Sample Analysis & Quality Control (QC) | CLP Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Data Validation Report |
| | Detection/Quantitation Limits | Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report), CLP Statement of Work (SOW), CLP National Functional Guidelines |
| | Detection/Quantitation Limit Calculations | Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Form 10 (instrument detection limit sheet), Form 13 (preparation log), Form 14 (analysis run log), calculation worksheet |
| | Concentration Adjustment Calculations | EPA fact sheet "Using Qualified Data to Document an Observed Release or Observed Contamination," calculation worksheet |
| | Verification of CLP Analysis | CLP documentation package, sampling trip report |
| EPA/Non-CLP | Sample Analysis Results & QC | Instrument-generated data sheets for sample results, QC data results as required by the method, data validation report, EPA programmatic standard documentation requirements |
| | Method Detection Limit (MDL) or equivalent | Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report) |
| | MDL Calculations | Definition and sample calculation in the data deliverable report; if not MDL, documentation of equivalence |
| | Method/Procedure Used for Analysis | SAP, QAPP, statement of work, data deliverable report, or equivalent |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | Other QC Documentation | Regulatory data from other EPA programs and standard documentation as required by program |
| Other Federal Program | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data above |
| | Other QC Documentation | Regulatory data from other programs and standard documentation reports required by the program |
| State/Non-CLP | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data above SAP, QAPP |
| | Other QC Documentation | State regulatory program data, discharge permit compliance forms, standard documentation as required by State program |
| PRP/Non-CLP equivalent | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data, SAP, QAPP |
| | Other QC Documentation | Administrative Consent Order (ACO) or Agreement on Consent (AOC) and required documentation, statements of data usability |
| Removal Actions | | |
| | Date of Removal Initiation and Completion | EPA Removal reports, RCRA Corrective Action reports, private industry compliance reports, State regulatory reports, aerial photographs |
| | Description of Removal/Containment Action | |
| | Cleanup Criteria | |
| | Confirmatory Sampling | |
| | Contamination/Past Release Remaining | |
| Sources | | |
| | Source Location and Description | Company records, permit applications, visual observations and measurements in field logbooks, aerial photographs, “as built” drawings, MSDS forms, company products lists, TRI and other EPA regulatory databases, NPDES permit applications and compliance reports, air permits, sampling trip reports (same as PA/SI and other sampling events), State records, Sanborn maps, Enviromapper |
| | Source Type | |
| | Containment Features | |
| | Associated Substances by | |
| | Sampling | |
| | Manifest | |
| | Discharges | |
| | Waste Quantity | |
| | Estimation Method | |
| Reproducible Measurements | | |
| Ground Water Pathway | | |
| Aquifer Description | | |
| | Strata | Topographic and geologic maps and cross sections, USGS and State survey studies, well logs, sampling reports, pump test reports, State well databases, sampling trip reports |
| | Aquifers | |
| | Confining Layers/Interconnections | |
| | Discontinuities | |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---|--|--|
| | Flow Direction | Field logbooks, sampling trip reports, test pits, local geologic maps indicating the dips, strikes, and faults, topographic maps if ground water flow follows topography, previously assembled local potentiometric gradient documentation |
| | Ground Water Use | USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State well databases, local water purveyors and drillers, well surveys, site reconnaissance logbooks |
| Likelihood of Release | | |
| Observed Release by Direct Observation | Depth to Ground Water | Well logs, test pits, sampling trip reports/logbooks |
| | Depth of Contamination | Test pits, soil borings, source descriptions in regulatory documents/PRP reports, engineering plans, disposal records |
| Observed Release by Chemical Analysis | Well Type (public, private, monitoring) | Water resources reports, water utilities, sampling trip reports, water purveyors and drillers, well permits, State and county water databases |
| | Well Depth | |
| | Aquifer Tapped | |
| | Well Development (conventional, direct push) | |
| | Sample Similarity | Sampling and analysis plans and reports, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, sample filtering information |
| | Sample Preparation | |
| | Attribution | |
| | Association with Source | See Sources information |
| | Other Possible Sources/Sites | Enviromapper, Federal and State regulatory databases, Sanborn maps, Phase I site assessment studies |
| Targets | | |
| Target Detection Limit (TDL) | TDL delineation | Source boundary information, USGS maps, GIS |
| | Wells per Distance Category | State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, site reconnaissance logbooks |
| | Well Location | USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, site reconnaissance logbooks, sampling trip reports |
| | Level of Contamination | Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) benchmarks |
| Population | Residents | |
| | Count per household | U.S. Census, field logbooks, interviews, access permission forms, water utilities |
| | Apportionment | Water utilities |
| | Workers | Interviews, Chamber of Commerce |
| | Closed Wells | Government closure document, water utility, public health department |
| | Date of Closure | |
| | Rationale | |
| | Sample at Closure | Sample reports |
| | Targets at Closure | See Residents under Population above |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|--|---|---|
| Other Targets | Wellhead Protection Area | State government agencies and laws and regulations, delineation maps |
| | Resources | State and Federal water resources programs and studies, water purveyors, county and local water utilities |
| Surface Water Pathway | | |
| Likelihood of Release | | |
| Observed Release by Direct Observation | Discharge or Spill | Interviews, affidavits, visual observations, photographs, field logbook, permit violations, other recorded violations, TDL map, sample location map, County records, flood zone maps, stream gauge records, News media reports of spills and floods |
| | Water Body Boundaries | |
| | Source Sample Location & Depth | |
| | Flood (including date and boundaries) | |
| Observed Release by Chemical Analysis | Sample Locations | Sampling plan, field logbooks, sample maps, USGS maps, sampling trip reports, laboratory analysis sheets with percent organic information |
| | Sample Type (water, sediment, fish tissue) | |
| | Sample Descriptions | |
| | Sample Similarity | |
| | Attribution | |
| | Association with Sources | See Sources section |
| | Other Possible Sources | Windshield survey, Enviromapper, EPA and State regulatory databases, CERCLIS, site historical information |
| Waste Characteristics | | |
| | Salinity | Analytical results, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, topographic map, field logbook, field biologist |
| | Water Body Type | |
| Targets | | |
| | Zones of Contamination by Threat | Sample location map, TDL map, USGS maps |
| Drinking Water Threat | Intakes | Public water utility, intake location map, USGS/water resources stream flow data, field logbook, State databases |
| | Location | |
| | Stream Flow at Intakes | |
| | Population Served including Date and Apportionment) | |
| Human Food Chain Threat | Fisheries | U.S. and State fish and wildlife programs, observations in field logbook, State fisheries programs, interviews, State and local tourist agencies |
| | Human Consumption | |
| | Fishing Locations | |
| | Catch data | |
| | Closed Fisheries | State official closure notice, State database |
| Sensitive Environments | Listed Environments | U.S. Fish and Wildlife/State wildlife biologist, National Heritage Program data, Federal and State authorizing legislation, Federal Register, State maps and brochures |
| | Specific Targets | |
| | Habitat Range | |
| | Location/Boundaries | |
| | Official Designation | |
| | Wetlands | National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, wetland specialist, State and Federal GIS databases |
| | NWI Designation | |
| Measurements | | |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s)^a |
|--|--|--|
| Resources | Resources | Enviromapper, topographic map, windshield survey, public water authority, State and county offices (e.g., health department, land use office), Chamber of Commerce |
| Soil Exposure Pathway, Resident Population Threat | | |
| Observed Contamination | | |
| | Contaminated Soil: Background and Release | Sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, site history, soil survey, sample location map |
| | Sample locations | |
| | Sample depth | |
| | Sample similarity | |
| | Interference Rationale | Information on mode of deposition |
| | Other Sources | Site history, sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, survey sample location map, topographic map |
| | Sample Location | |
| | Sample Depth | |
| | Source Boundary | |
| | Attribution | See Surface Water Pathway suggestions |
| Waste Quantity | | |
| | Source Type | Site history, field logbook, survey, affidavits, manifests |
| | Calculations | Field logbook, survey, affidavits, field logbook, topographic map, sample location map, measuring instruments with worksheets |
| Targets | | |
| | Residents | Field logbook, sample location map, sampling and analysis plan, plat maps, House by House survey (actual count), U.S. Census Bureau Web site |
| | On Property and within 200 feet | |
| | Population per household | |
| | Students | Topographic map, sample location map, board of education, survey/interview with school management staff (actual count) |
| | School Location | |
| | Number of Students | |
| | Workers | Topographic map, sample location map, field logbook, survey (actual count), facility records, Chamber of Commerce |
| | Location | |
| | Number | |
| | Level of Contamination | Sample analytical result, HRS/SCDM benchmark |
| | Sensitive Environments | U.S. Fish and Wildlife, USDA Forest Service, National Park Service NWI map, sample location map, field biologist, field logbook |
| | Official Designation | |
| | Location | |
| | Habitat Range | |

^a Whenever secondary references are cited (e.g., most sample investigation reports), the scoring information should be further supported by a primary reference (e.g., field logbooks). See the *Regional QC Guidance Manual* (EPA Publication 9345.1-08, December 1991), Section 2.4.1, p. 16, for examples of primary versus secondary reference sources.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|--|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | | | | | Work Assignment Number 2-01 | | | | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number: 000005 | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-016 | | | Contract Period 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 Base <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option Period Number | | | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name | | | | |
| Contractor COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION | | | | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW | | | | | |
| Purpose: <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | | | | | Period of Performance From 08/01/2012 To 07/31/2014 | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund Accounting and Appropriations Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SFO (Max 2) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period: | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | | | |
| 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| This Action: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| Cumulative Approved: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name Robert Myers <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number 703-603-8851 FAX Number: | | | |
| Project Officer Name Crystal Gatson <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 703-603-9023 FAX Number: | | | |
| Other Agency Official Name <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number: | | | |
| Contracting Official Name Eric Schermerhorn <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-6095 FAX Number: | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|---|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | | | | | Work Assignment Number 2-01 | | | | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number: 000006 | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-016 | | | Contract Period 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 Base Option Period Number 1 | | | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name Support for NPL Updates | | | | |
| Contractor COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION | | | | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW | | | | | |
| Purpose: <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | | | | | Period of Performance From 08/01/2012 To 07/31/2015 | | | | |
| Comments: The purpose of this action is to incorporate the attached SOW and extend the period of performance through 07/31/2015. Contractor shall submit a work plan and cost estimate in accordance with the terms of the contract. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund Accounting and Appropriations Data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations date use EPA Form 1900-69A. | | | | | | | | | | |
| SFO <input type="checkbox"/> (Max 2) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period: | | Cost/Fee: | | | | LOE: 0 | | | | |
| 08/09/2010 To 07/31/2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| This Action: | | | | | | 52,420 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 52,420 | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cumulative Approved: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | | LOE: | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name Robert Myers <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number 703-603-8851 FAX Number: | | | |
| Project Officer Name Crystal Gatson <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 703-603-9023 FAX Number: | | | |
| Other Agency Official Name <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number: | | | |
| Contracting Official Name Mark Heare <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>_____ (Signature)</div> <div>_____ (Date)</div> </div> | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-4774 FAX Number: | | | |

Performance Work Statement

Work Assignment Number: 2-01

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. Title: Support for National Priorities List (NPL) Updates

B. Work Assignment Manager: Terry Jeng
US EPA
OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8852, Fax (703) 603-9112
email: jeng.terry@epa.gov

Alternate Work Assignment Manager: Robert Myers
US EPA
OSRTI (5204P)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC, 20460
Work: (703) 603-8851, Fax (703) 603-9112
email: myers.robert@epa.gov

C. OBJECTIVE

This work assignment provides technical support to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Agency's technical review of sites that are candidates for the NPL updates under the revised Hazard Ranking System (HRS). The purpose of the technical review, known as the Quality Assurance (QA) review, is to ensure that the technical basis used to support a site listing decision is consistent with the revised HRS rule as defined in the December 14, 1990 Federal Register, as well as EPA's technical guidance.

This work assignment also supports other HRS and NPL rulemaking activities. This includes NPL site characteristic information and tracking, web posting and Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) support.

D. BACKGROUND

Federal responsibility for the assessment and cleanup of sites contaminated by hazardous wastes resides with the U.S. EPA under the authority of several statutes, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI), is one of EPA's primary offices for implementation of CERCLA.

CERCLA enacted in 1980, and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), provides the Federal Government broad authority for responding to the dangers posed by uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The EPA

responded by developing the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which is a scoring system used to establish the National Priorities List (NPL). On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA revised the HRS, as required by SARA. The revised HRS became effective on March 14, 1991. The HRS is the primary mechanism used to add sites to the NPL.

The Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch (SARDB) in OSRTI is responsible for discovering sites, evaluating their potential threat to human health and the environment, implementing the HRS, proposing and adding them to the NPL and maintaining public information regarding these activities via the web and other OSRTI data systems. A key component of implementing the HRS is evaluating exposure pathways, including surface and groundwater contamination.

This Performance Work Statement is to be used as a notice of a continuation of work currently being performed by CSC under EPA contract # EP-W-10-016.

E. Quality Assurance:

The tasks in this assignment require the use of secondary data. Collection, use and analysis of data will be governed by procedures described in the quality assurance project plan (QAPP) and consistent with the Agency's quality assurance (QA) requirements. The project specific quality assurance requirements must be addressed in the monthly progress reports.

II. TASK DETAIL

The contractor shall perform the following tasks:

Task 0 – Work Plan and Budget Development

The contractor shall prepare a detailed work plan and budget for the accomplishment of the indicated tasks in accordance with the clause *Work Assignments* (EPAAR 1552.211-74), Alternate I. The work plan shall include cost estimates a description of: (a) proposed staff; (b) the number of hours and labor classifications proposed for each task, to include both prime contractor and subcontractor labor; and (c) a list of deliverables, with due dates and schedule for deliverables. This task also includes weekly telephone conferences between the WAM and the project manager, to coordinate and confirm task performance. The contractor shall also submit monthly progress and financial reports pursuant clause, F.2, MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT (EPAAR 211-70)

Prior to initiating any action under technical direction, the EPA WAM shall ensure that the technical direction falls within the scope of work for this Work Assignment. The contractor shall charge and track time site-specifically whenever applicable. With a few exceptions where general support is given, most of the work under Task 1 (QA) and Task 3 (Technical Assistance) should be charged to specific sites. Site Spill Identifier (SSID) numbers used for tracking the sites shall be provided to the contractor by EPA for the purpose of site-specific charging.

Task 1: QA Review

EPA HQ will provide the contractor with a list of sites that have been approved by EPA management to go forward for QA review, and the EPA will provide the contractor with the site

HRS documentation records and associated references (hard and/or electronic copies). The contractor shall assign contractor Regional Coordinators (RCs), who will serve as the points of contact for QA issues with the respective EPA HQ RCs and the Regional NPL Coordinators. Task 1 will consist of the following components:

1) QA Review

Upon receipt, the contractor shall review each HRS package to ensure that the HRS is properly and consistently applied and identify data gaps to help assure that the site scoring approach has the best chance of meeting legal challenges. Based on the litigation potential, complexity of the site scoring approach or other factors, the EPA WAM will identify the level of QA review to be performed on each HRS package. Unless otherwise specified by the EPA WAM or EPA HQ RC, all levels of QA review will include a documentation completeness check, qualitative reference check, mathematical/assigned values check, issue identification and qualitative analytical data documentation check. The EPA WAM will identify in writing to the contractor WAM the sites for which QA review shall be initiated and the level of QA review that each site is to receive. The contractor shall identify the level of QA review conducted in the QA letters and monthly progress and status reports. The levels of QA review are:

- Full or Standard QA Review – The full QA review will consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, and a review of all assertions made in HRS documentation records, all calculated and assigned values and all reference citations supporting those assertions and values. The proportion of time spent during the QA review will reflect the relative importance of the pathways and/or factors. The time taken to review portions of the package not contributing significantly to the overall site score will be a small fraction of the time taken to review the significant portions of the site package.
- Streamlined QA Review - This review is designed to address major issues and ensure a supportable score, but not provide some of the QA details needed for more complicated sites. Sites are typically one pathway. The EPA will provide guidance for performing the QA for that specific site, which will generally follow the below format:
 - Perform a preliminary review of the HRS documentation record, narrative and score sheets to identify the critical or key scoring/policy factors. Ensure minimum partial attribution if needed for key factors.
 - Ensure proper HRS values have been assigned to critical information.
 - Review reference citations and analytical data for the critical or key scoring factors. Identify any key factor concerns to HQ.
 - Perform low level review of entire document once for any glaring errors not associated with critical scoring factors. This includes math calculation errors, internal inconsistencies, and repetitious materials. Check reference list to make sure it matches the references identified in the HRS documentation record.
 - Prepare QA letter.
 - Identify which parts of this review took the most time.

- Abbreviated QA Review – The abbreviated QA review will consist of a thorough qualitative assessment of the HRS documentation record, which will include identification of technical, policy and HRS scoring and application issues. The primary distinction between the abbreviated QA review and full QA review is that no reference citations will be verified during the abbreviated QA review and, typically, there will be only one round of review on an HRS package and one final summation of any issues not resolved by the Region in the final submission.
- Intensive QA Review – Under certain cases where the EPA perceives a high risk of litigation regarding a site, the EPA may task the contractor to perform one or more of the following assignments:
 - Review Sampling Documentation and Procedures
 - Review sampling logbooks and primary sampling reports (e.g., expanded site inspections [ESIs], remedial investigations/feasibility studies [RI/FSs], etc.) from cover to cover to ensure that documentation is accurate and consistent for key samples and key sample locations, and that sample location maps are consistent with sample location descriptions.
 - Review whether field standard operating procedures (SOPs) for collection of critical samples were documented in the HRS package and whether, based on information presented in the HRS package (e.g., logbooks, primary sampling reports), SOPs were followed. Request sampling SOPs and sample plans from the Regions, as needed.
 - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that samples are consistently identified (or adequate information is provided to crosswalk sample ID numbers definitively).
 - Review Data Quality
 - Review chain of custody forms to ensure that holding times were met. Review sample handling procedures and sample preservation and identify field duplicates.
 - Evaluate whether adequate quality control (QC) samples (field blanks, duplicates, etc.) were collected.
 - Review laboratory reports and/or data validation reports and procedures to identify deviations from laboratory QC guidelines. In cases where deviations from sample handling procedures or laboratory QC guidelines are apparent, review whether either: 1) deviations are accounted for through data validation; or 2) adequate information is provided in the HRS package to validate the data, if necessary. Review whether analytical data are adjusted according to HRS policy.
 - Ensure Package Integrity
 - Examine information included in references with the HRS package but not used in scoring to identify issues that could be raised during response to public comments or that could contradict the scoring strategy.

- Ensure that documentation included in the HRS package (e.g., maps, field logbooks) is adequate to characterize and/or rule out contributions from other potential sources in the area.

If at any time during QA review issues are identified that could cause the site score to drop below 28.50 using the HRS, the contractor shall promptly alert EPA HQ.

2) QA Letter

After completing QA review on an HRS site package submission, the contractor shall prepare a QA letter. If major issues arise, the contractor shall discuss them with the Regional NPL Coordinator and the EPA HQ RC prior to submittal of the QA letter. The purpose of the QA letter is to provide EPA HQ and the Region with written comments on problems or weaknesses in HRS documentation records and, as appropriate and according to the level of QA review, the reference packages. These letters will be comprehensive, such that once all problems cited in the letter are addressed, the site package will be ready to pass QA (in absence of new QA issues). Upon completion, the contractor shall send each QA letter concurrently to the EPA WAM, appropriate EPA HQ RC (who serves as task monitor) and the appropriate EPA NPL Coordinator in the Region, unless otherwise instructed. The Regional NPL Coordinator will then make the necessary changes to the HRS package and resubmit the revised HRS package to the contractor. When time permits during a scheduled NPL update and depending on the level of QA review selected, there may be several rounds of QA letters and full or partial HRS package resubmissions. After all issues are addressed to the extent feasible by the Region and primarily editorial comments remain, the contractor shall provide the EPA WAM and the Region with a redlined version of the HRS documentation record showing any remaining proposed corrections. Once the Region has reviewed and accepted these corrections, the EPA WAM will notify the contractor, who will make these corrections, producing a final version of the HRS documentation record. The contractor shall follow the format of the QA letter provided by the EPA in Attachment #1.

3) Conference Calls

Following issuance of QA letter, the contractor shall have their Regional Coordinator and QA reviewers participate in conference calls when necessary with the EPA WAM, EPA HQ and the Regions to clarify issues and discuss areas of disagreement. The frequency of the conference calls shall be based on the need. This frequency will vary by Region and number of packages undergoing QA (Approximately 30 packages undergo QA per year). The contractor's Regional Coordinator and appropriate technical staff shall be responsible for reviewing site packages and discussing QA issues during the conference call. These same staff people shall have responsibility for reviewing the same site packages during any subsequent formal QA of the site package that takes place. The contractor shall provide the HQ RC, the NPL coordinator in the Region and the EPA WAM with conference call notes (telecons) summarizing any action items and decisions within 3 business days following the call.

TASK 2: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Subtask 1 - Trips to Regions: The contractor shall travel to the Region in response to special requests for pre-HRS and HRS technical support. These requests will be relayed to the contractor by the EPA WAM through written technical direction. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest to the Region, shall provide the Region with technical support in the following areas: review file information on NPL candidate sites, advise the Region in preparing the HRS package for submittal to EPA, perform preliminary review of the draft HRS package, and give advice as to the options for revising the package, including any changes in approach that require immediate attention. The cost of these trips shall be charged site-specifically. Upon return from a Regional trip, the contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the trip. The report shall include any issues that need to be resolved by EPA Headquarters in order to enable the Region to proceed with preparation or revision of the HRS documentation record package.

Assumptions:

Three trips needing technical assistance during each year of contract performance which will include visits to 2 locations. For estimation purposes, assume the following technical assistance trips:

- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 2 for 3 days
- 1 trip (2 people) to Region 5 for 2 days.

Should the support involve a site visit with potential review of the contaminated area, the contractor shall comply with the Eight-Hour OSHA training requirements, per 29 CFR 1910.120 Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) Training. OSHA defines this as an eight-hour refresher course. In addition, to ensure adequate protection, the contractor shall consult with Regional personnel to inquire about any possible risks posed at the site.

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls and Other General Technical Assistance Support:

Technical support could also include review of site investigations or sampling plans or participation in site screening discussions. Such support does not necessarily require a trip to the Region. Discussion of technical review and consultation can be achieved through conference calls and review of written materials. The contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the conference call. The EPA WAM will inform the contractor which sites have been approved for technical assistance.

TASK 3: Meetings and Consultation with SARD Branch

The contractor shall support EPA as follows:

Subtask 1- Status Meeting: As directed by the EPA WAM, the contractor shall attend meetings with EPA on the status of NPL Updates at EPA HQ. These meetings will be infrequent (up to 2 per year) since most status updates are easily conducted by phone. However, such meetings may

be necessary prior to Federal Register publication. Meetings, as appropriate, shall be held between the contractor's QA team and the HQ RCs. In addition, the designated contractor's Regional contacts shall contact each of their 10 EPA Regional NPL Coordinators weekly (only if there is any HRS activity in the Region) to provide an update on the status of sites in the Region.

Subtask 2 - Post-Rule QA Site Briefings: If determined necessary by EPA WAM and requested via TDD, shortly after rule publication, the contractor shall prepare briefings that will help identify potential issues for response to comments as well as common themes that came up in QA. The briefings will include a summary of highlights for all of the sites. For each site, the briefings will include some brief site background and discuss QA issues that went unresolved as well as other interesting/controversial QA-type issues. Following submittal of written materials to EPA, the contractor shall deliver the briefings via conference call to EPA HQ and Regions.

The contractor shall use the information collected for purposes of the site briefings to maintain a collection of QA issues and their resolutions, grouped by issues type and including site name, so that they can easily be referenced by EPA. This will include common QA issues that can be applied to other sites or particularly unusual QA issues.

Subtask 3 - Status Report: Each month a report on the status of all sites in QA or technical assistance shall be delivered concurrently to the EPA WAM, HQ RCs, and NPL Coordinators in each region. The report shall be delivered as part of the monthly report.

Subtask 4 – Conference Support: The contractor may be requested to attend conference meetings in support of HRS and NPL work being performed under this-work assignment. Contractor participation/attendance will be requested (via written technical direction) and approved by EPA approximately 16 calendar days prior to the conference. For estimation purposes, the contractor should assume sending one staff member to Denver for 3 days to support this task.

Subtask 5 – Meeting and Workgroup Support:

The contractor shall support OSRTI in developing and preparing for meetings, briefings, workgroups, conferences, etc., at which guidance and related issues are communicated to the site assessment community by EPA. The contractor shall perform activities such as: (1) gather and summarize technical information; (2) analyze technical and related data; (3) prepare technical reports and related materials on activities, operations, problems, and trends; (4) develop presentations and briefings (oral, written, and audiovisual); (5) plan, coordinate, and prepare materials for meetings, workgroups, and conferences; (6) present and demonstrate materials at meetings, workgroups, and conferences; and (7) make available all necessary services, equipment, and materials to supply full audiovisual and graphics capabilities. The contractor shall anticipate support for 1 meeting per year.

TASK 4: Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records

The contractor shall respond to up to two special requests for research and analysis of HRS Documentation Records. The requests are highly variable and may range from 2 hours to 200

hours. This research and analysis may be in response to inquiries from Congress, other government agencies or EPA management. This research and analysis could apply to all sites proposed under the original and revised HRS and sites that are currently undergoing QA review. The research could, but not always will, begin with a database search for a certain subset of sites and might include research into the HRS documentation records to further narrow down the subset of sites (for example, finding all sites listed based on contaminated sediments). For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate 40 hours of research and analysis per request (total 80 hours).

TASK 5 - Support for NPL Rule Publication and Scoring Information:

The contractor shall support activities related to NPL proposed and final rule publication. These activities will consist of the following components for each NPL rulemaking:

- 1) Reviewing, formatting and creating PDFs with 508 compliance the narrative summaries for each site.
- 2) Delivering electronic versions of the HRS documentation records, supporting documentation and any other necessary associated documents.
- 3) Filling in names and addresses on congressional notification letters using an EPA-provided MS Word template. The contractor shall verify congressional district and verify senator and representative names on the house.gov and senate.gov websites. Contractor shall deliver letters and associated mailing labels electronically to EPA WAM via email.
- 4) For each final rule, the contractor shall compile all support documents into PDF files; files shall be paginated and meet agency requirements. The contractor shall prepare the title page, abstract, contents, executive summary, introduction, and glossary for the PDF files. The PDF files shall be delivered by email concurrently to the EPA WAM for posting on the web along with the other NPL rule information, and to the EPA WAM.
- 5) On an as-needed basis, preparing any necessary public information documents and background information. This shall be tasked via TD by the EPA WAM.

The contractor shall post these documents plus state concurrence letters (provided by the EPA WAM) to the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) no later than 5 business days prior to FR publication (with the exception of last minute changes to documents by EPA).

The contractor shall prepare NPL listing information (including state correspondence documents) for website publication and provide it to the WAM and OSRTI web change request mailbox by 9:00 am at least one day prior to the issuance of the EPA press release (which generally occurs 2 days prior to FR publication date). The EPA WAM will give the contractor at least 5 days advance notice of the exact date of NPL rule publication. However, the projected date of rule publication shall be given to the contractor by EPA at least 4 months in advance. EPA anticipates two rule

publications each year (each rule publication consisting of one proposed and one final rule). The contractor shall convert HRS documentation records to PDF format for publication on the Internet.

Four days prior to rule publication the contractor shall send the WAM an electronic spreadsheet containing site names, locations, CERCLIS ID #s, HRS scores, federal facility indicators, FDMS docket numbers and NPL status for the sites being proposed and added to the NPL.

Maintain Scoring Information

The contractor shall maintain a subset of listing-related data including, but not limited to: HRS scores, site narratives, listing dates, etc. The contractor shall provide EPA data and analysis support including responding to ad hoc requests for reports and analyses of site characteristics and scoring information from existing electronic data sources and HRS-related documents. For planning purposes, the contractor shall anticipate up to six queries per year.

TASK 6: Analyze HRS Issues

When issues that are not specifically or clearly addressed in existing guidance surface during the contractor's preparation or QA review of an HRS package, the contractor shall notify the WAM regarding a need for additional analysis. The contractor shall prepare an analysis and present the issue to the EPA WAM and the SARD Branch. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for five such analyses during twelve month period. The contractor is responsible for all research and write-up as well as attending meetings or participating in conference calls where the issue is discussed and offering solutions or past experiences from other sites relevant to the case, as appropriate.

The analyses shall be concise and, where applicable, shall provide the following information:

- Considerations affecting a decision.
- Several options for resolving the issue.
- Advantages and disadvantages of different options.
- Recommended approach with rationale for recommendation.
- Estimated percentage of sites affected by issue (if requested by the EPA WAM).

The contractor shall provide electronic copies of draft HRS analysis papers and supporting documentation to the WAM. SARDB will then meet to decide the best way to resolve the issues. The contractor's Regional Coordinator, and/or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest shall participate in the meeting and summarize all discussions. Following each meeting, the contractor shall finalize the resolution of each issue, using EPA's input/recommendation. For cost estimation purposes, the contractor shall estimate a total of 80 hours.

TASK 7: Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) – Updating Values for Particular Substances and Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool

During QA review of an HRS documentation record, there may arise a need for the contractor to evaluate and/or update SCDM values for particular substances by reviewing current references and databases, searching for new data sources, reviewing risk exposure assumptions, reviewing current algorithms and laws, and regulations/rules on benchmark-setting criteria.

For the particular chemical/substance, the contractor shall provide updated values for each associated HRS factor value (e.g., toxicity, mobility) and benchmark values presented in SCDM. For planning purposes, the contractor shall estimate that it shall be responsible for six SCDM analyses during the contract year.

Further, the contractor shall provide maintenance support for the SCDM Data Management Tool previously developed, and update the tool in the future as necessary. This will involve following up and finalizing the SCDM benchmark revisions and implementing the data management tool. The contractor shall anticipate the need for user support and tool refinements during the early months of implementation, as normal for initial startup after database development.

The contractor shall continue to support EPA in the final revision effort of the SCDM benchmarks. This may include follow up discussions with EPA to answer questions and incorporating changes before the values and methodology are finalized. Once values are updated and incorporated into the SCDM data management tool, the contractor shall provide reports to replace those currently posted on the SCDM website. The contractor shall also coordinate with HRS site scorers, QuickScore developers, and/or EPA developers of Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) and Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) regarding the updated SCDM values.

Task 8: Other Analysis

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the collection, extraction, analysis and quality assurance of data (for example, site assessment technical information, State and tribal data, etc.) maintained in Agency information systems. These systems include but are not limited to CERCLIS, SCDM, and HRS QuickScore. For estimation purposes, plan on one analysis per year averaging 100 hours each.

Task 9: Superfund Alternative Approach (SAA)

The contractor shall support OSRTI in the implementation of the Superfund Alternative Approach policy and guidance. This support may include technical analysis, support for workgroups, tracking of SAA data or assistance drafting technical guidance. For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 100 hours per year.

Task 10: Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support

The contractor shall also support OSRTI by performing technical analyses associated with policy development, regulations, and legislative initiatives. Example of issues associated with this support are analyses concerning the role of the NPL; policy options for addressing mega sites via site listing; States' roles within the waste cleanup program, and state cleanup accomplishments; and program performance measures beyond construction completions (e.g., Superfund

Alternative Approach). For planning purposes, the contractor should anticipate that work for this task will vary and not to exceed 200 hours per year.

III. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

The deliverables shall be due as stated below. The contractor shall provide the WAM all deliverables and drafts in electronic format only. Electronic files must also be provided upon completion of the work assignment.

| | <u>Deliverable</u> | <u>Due Date</u> |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Task 0: | Work Plan | Within 20 days after receipt of work assignment. |
| | Monthly Progress Report | 15 th of each month. |
| Task 1: | | |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | QA Letter | Due 20 business days after receipt of HRS package for a one pathway site plus an additional 5 business days for each additional pathway, or as determined by the EPA WAM. |
| <u>Subtask 3</u> | Teleconference Call Notes | Due within 3 business days following conference call. |
| Task 2: | | |
| <u>Subtask 1</u> | Technical Assistance Trips | Travel will be tasked by the EPA WAM. The report summarizing the issues discussed on each site shall be due five business days after conclusion of the trip. |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | TA Conference Call Notes | Due within 3 business days following conference call. |
| Task 3: | | |
| <u>Subtask 1</u> | Status Meeting | Meeting upon request of EPA WAM. |
| | Contact with EPA HQ RCs | Weekly (if HRS packages are being reviewed). |
| <u>Subtask 2</u> | Post-Rule HQ Briefings | No later than 12 business days following publication of proposed rules (if tasked by WAM). |

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| <u>Subtask 3</u> | Monthly Status Report | Due by the last business day of each month in electronic format. |
| <u>Subtask 4</u> | Conference Support | Will be specified 14 days prior to conference. |
| <u>Subtask 5</u> | Meeting and Workgroup Support | Will be specified by WAM . |
| Task 4: | Research/Analysis of HRS Doc Records | As specified by EPA WAM. Due between 1 and 14 days from start of task depending on complexity of request. |
| Task 5: | Ad hoc NPL data queries | 24 hours unless specified differently by EPA WAM |
| | Support for NPL rule | Files formatted, Internet-ready and delivered to EPA by 9:00 am one day prior to NPL rule publication |
| | Spreadsheet with site info | Four business days prior to rule publication |
| | Site Packages | Due two weeks prior to the projected Federal Register publication date, as established by the NPL Rule Manager. |
| | Documentation Records And Support Documents | Docket submission at least 5 business days prior to NPL rule publication. |
| | Posting to FDMS: | No later than 5 business days prior to rule publication unless otherwise directed by EPA WAM |
| | Public Information Materials | Will be specified by EPA WAM |
| Task 6: | Analyze HRS Issues | Work will be initiated by EPA WAM. Draft HRS issues analyses are due 4 business prior to discussion call with EPA. Records of discussion, including draft resolution, are due 5 business days after the discussion conference call. The WAM or task monitor will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final resolution writeups are due 2 business days following receipt of WAM or task monitor comments. |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Task 7: | Update SCDM value | Work will be initiated when a change in value for a particular chemical causes SCDM values to change. Draft SCDM analyses are due 21 business days after change of value causing SCDM value to change. The WAM will review the draft and provide comments or corrections; final SCDM values are due 7 business days following receipt of WAM comments. |
| | Implementation and Maintenance of Revised SCDM Benchmarks and Data Management Tool | Deliverable due dates will be negotiated with contractor prior to start of work either verbally or via TD, issued by either WAM or alternate. |
| Task 8: | Other analysis | Will be specified by EPA WAM. |
| Task 9: | Superfund Alternative Approach | Will be specified by EPA WAM. |
| Task 10: | Policy, Regulation, and Legislative Support | Will be specified by the WAM. |

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Software Application Files and Accessibility

Software Application files, if delivered to the Government, shall conform to the requirements relating to accessibility as detailed to the 1998 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, particularly, but not limited to, § 1194.21 Software applications and operating systems and § 1194.22 Web-based intranet and internet information and applications. See: <http://www.section508.gov/>

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Preferred text format: | MS Word, 2007 or higher (Office 2007 or higher) |
| Preferred presentation format: | Power Point, Office 2007 or higher |
| Preferred graphics format: | Each graphic is an individual GIF file |
| Preferred portable format: | Adobe Acrobat, version X |
| Preferred chart format: | MS Excel/Access for tables |

APPENDIX A

EPA Work Assignment Manager (WAM):

Has overall responsibility for monitoring contractor performance on Work assignment; also provides written technical direction.

Task Monitors:

Regional NPL Coordinators: Also known as Regional Technical Contact (in lieu of Regional NPL Coordinator). The Headquarters contractors will interface with the Regional NPL Coordinator and will discuss with them issues regarding the preparation of the HRS Documentation Record packages, site-specific issues or general HRS or site assessment issues.

Headquarters Regional Coordinator: The Headquarters Regional Coordinator is responsible for clarifying policy and guidance issues during preparation of the HRS package. The HQ Regional Coordinator shall serve as the main EPA HQ contact and participate in all discussions regarding sites in their Regions.

R1: Terry Jeng
R2: Terry Jeng
R3: Terry Jeng
R4: Robert Myers
R5: Robert Myers
R6: Terry Jeng
R7: Robert Myers
R8: Robert Lausch (Drew)
R9: Robert Myers
R10: Robert Myers

Attachment 1

X^{xx} (e.g., 1st, 2nd) QA Review of HRS Scoring Package for Proposal XX

Site Name:

Location:

Site Score:

Number of Pathways:

Region:

Preparer:

Reviewer:

Date:

1.0 Site Description and General Comments

1.1 Site Description

1.2 General Comments

2.0 Cross-Cutting and Source Characterization Issues

3.0 Technical Issues (*by Pathway*)

3.1 Likelihood of Release

3.2 Waste Characteristics

3.3 Targets

4.0 Referencing and Editorial Issues

5.0 Potential Listing Policy Issues

Attachment 2

HRS Documentation Record Information Requiring Support by Documentation and Possible References For Major HRS Pathways

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Site Introduction | | |
| | Address | City Plat Map, tax records, police and fire departments, government records |
| | Center Point for Latitude/Longitude | USGS map, GIS data, TopoZone |
| | History | Company records and documents, Chamber of Commerce, tax records, Sanborn maps, news articles |
| | Information on Site Vicinity | USGS map, Enviromapper |
| Sampling & Analytical Data | | |
| ALL Sampling Data | Sampling Date | Field logbook, chain-of-custody form, sampling trip report |
| | Sample Location | Field logbook, sampling trip report, sample location map |
| | Sample Description | Field logbook, sampling trip report |
| | Sampling Method and Procedures | Program-wide or site-specific field SAP, QAPP, field logbooks, sampling method document |
| EPA/ CLP or Equivalent | Sample Analysis & Quality Control (QC) | CLP Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Data Validation Report |
| | Detection/Quantitation Limits | Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report), CLP Statement of Work (SOW), CLP National Functional Guidelines |
| | Detection/Quantitation Limit Calculations | Form 1 (inorganic/organic analysis data sheet), Form 10 (instrument detection limit sheet), Form 13 (preparation log), Form 14 (analysis run log), calculation worksheet |
| | Concentration Adjustment Calculations | EPA fact sheet "Using Qualified Data to Document an Observed Release or Observed Contamination," calculation worksheet |
| | Verification of CLP Analysis | CLP documentation package, sampling trip report |
| EPA/Non-CLP | Sample Analysis Results & QC | Instrument-generated data sheets for sample results, QC data results as required by the method, data validation report, EPA programmatic standard documentation requirements |
| | Method Detection Limit (MDL) or equivalent | Analysis data sheets (data deliverable report) |
| | MDL Calculations | Definition and sample calculation in the data deliverable report; if not MDL, documentation of equivalence |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Other Federal Program | Method/Procedure Used for Analysis | SAP, QAPP, statement of work, data deliverable report, or equivalent |
| | Other QC Documentation | Regulatory data from other EPA programs and standard documentation as required by program |
| | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data above |
| | Other QC Documentation | Regulatory data from other programs and standard documentation reports required by the program |
| State/Non-CLP | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data above SAP, QAPP |
| | Other QC Documentation | State regulatory program data, discharge permit compliance forms, standard documentation as required by State program |
| PRP/Non-CLP equivalent | Sampling & Analysis Information | See references identified for EPA/Non-CLP data, SAP, QAPP |
| | Other QC Documentation | Administrative Consent Order (ACO) or Agreement on Consent (AOC) and required documentation, statements of data usability |
| Removal Actions | | |
| | Date of Removal Initiation and Completion | EPA Removal reports, RCRA Corrective Action reports, private industry compliance reports, State regulatory reports, aerial photographs |
| | Description of Removal/Containment Action | |
| | Cleanup Criteria | |
| | Confirmatory Sampling | |
| | Contamination/Past Release Remaining | |
| Sources | | |
| | Source Location and Description | Company records, permit applications, visual observations and measurements in field logbooks, aerial photographs, “as built” drawings, MSDS forms, company products lists, TRI and other EPA regulatory databases, NPDES permit applications and compliance reports, air permits, sampling trip reports (same as PA/SI and other sampling events), State records, Sanborn maps, Enviromapper |
| | Source Type | |
| | Containment Features | |
| | Associated Substances by | |
| | Sampling | |
| | Manifest | |
| | Discharges | |
| | Waste Quantity | |
| | Estimation Method | |
| Reproducible Measurements | | |
| Ground Water Pathway | | |
| Aquifer Description | | |
| | Strata | Topographic and geologic maps and cross sections, USGS and State survey studies, well logs, sampling reports, pump test reports, State well databases, sampling trip reports |
| | Aquifers | |
| | Confining Layers/Interconnections | |
| | Discontinuities | |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|---|--|--|
| | Flow Direction | Field logbooks, sampling trip reports, test pits, local geologic maps indicating the dips, strikes, and faults, topographic maps if ground water flow follows topography, previously assembled local potentiometric gradient documentation |
| | Ground Water Use | USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State well databases, local water purveyors and drillers, well surveys, site reconnaissance logbooks |
| Likelihood of Release | | |
| Observed Release by Direct Observation | Depth to Ground Water | Well logs, test pits, sampling trip reports/logbooks |
| | Depth of Contamination | Test pits, soil borings, source descriptions in regulatory documents/PRP reports, engineering plans, disposal records |
| Observed Release by Chemical Analysis | Well Type (public, private, monitoring) | Water resources reports, water utilities, sampling trip reports, water purveyors and drillers, well permits, State and county water databases |
| | Well Depth | |
| | Aquifer Tapped | |
| | Well Development (conventional, direct push) | |
| | Sample Similarity | Sampling and analysis plans and reports, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, sample filtering information |
| | Sample Preparation | |
| | Attribution | |
| | Association with Source | See Sources information |
| | Other Possible Sources/Sites | Enviromapper, Federal and State regulatory databases, Sanborn maps, Phase I site assessment studies |
| Targets | | |
| Target Detection Limit (TDL) | TDL delineation | Source boundary information, USGS maps, GIS |
| | Wells per Distance Category | State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, sampling trip reports, site reconnaissance logbooks |
| | Well Location | USGS and State survey studies, national and State water resources research studies, State databases, water utilities, field logbooks, site reconnaissance logbooks, sampling trip reports |
| | Level of Contamination | Superfund Chemical Data Matrix (SCDM) benchmarks |
| Population | Residents | |
| | Count per household | U.S. Census, field logbooks, interviews, access permission forms, water utilities |
| | Apportionment | Water utilities |
| | Workers | Interviews, Chamber of Commerce |
| | Closed Wells | Government closure document, water utility, public health department |
| | Date of Closure | |
| | Rationale | |
| | Sample at Closure | Sample reports |
| | Targets at Closure | See Residents under Population above |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s) ^a |
|--|---|---|
| Other Targets | Wellhead Protection Area | State government agencies and laws and regulations, delineation maps |
| | Resources | State and Federal water resources programs and studies, water purveyors, county and local water utilities |
| Surface Water Pathway | | |
| Likelihood of Release | | |
| Observed Release by Direct Observation | Discharge or Spill | Interviews, affidavits, visual observations, photographs, field logbook, permit violations, other recorded violations, TDL map, sample location map, County records, flood zone maps, stream gauge records, News media reports of spills and floods |
| | Water Body Boundaries | |
| | Source Sample Location & Depth | |
| | Flood (including date and boundaries) | |
| Observed Release by Chemical Analysis | Sample Locations | Sampling plan, field logbooks, sample maps, USGS maps, sampling trip reports, laboratory analysis sheets with percent organic information |
| | Sample Type (water, sediment, fish tissue) | |
| | Sample Descriptions | |
| | Sample Similarity | |
| | Attribution | |
| | Association with Sources | See Sources section |
| | Other Possible Sources | Windshield survey, Enviromapper, EPA and State regulatory databases, CERCLIS, site historical information |
| Waste Characteristics | | |
| | Salinity | Analytical results, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, topographic map, field logbook, field biologist |
| | Water Body Type | |
| Targets | | |
| | Zones of Contamination by Threat | Sample location map, TDL map, USGS maps |
| Drinking Water Threat | Intakes | Public water utility, intake location map, USGS/water resources stream flow data, field logbook, State databases |
| | Location | |
| | Stream Flow at Intakes | |
| | Population Served including Date and Apportionment) | |
| Human Food Chain Threat | Fisheries | U.S. and State fish and wildlife programs, observations in field logbook, State fisheries programs, interviews, State and local tourist agencies |
| | Human Consumption | |
| | Fishing Locations | |
| | Catch data | |
| | Closed Fisheries | State official closure notice, State database |
| Sensitive Environments | Listed Environments | U.S. Fish and Wildlife/State wildlife biologist, National Heritage Program data, Federal and State authorizing legislation, Federal Register, State maps and brochures |
| | Specific Targets | |
| | Habitat Range | |
| | Location/Boundaries | |
| | Official Designation | |
| | Wetlands | National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, wetland specialist, State and Federal GIS databases |
| | NWI Designation | |
| Measurements | | |

| HRS Section/Topic | Information requiring Documentation | Possible Reference(s)^a |
|---|--|--|
| Resources | Resources | Enviromapper, topographic map, windshield survey, public water authority, State and county offices (e.g., health department, land use office), Chamber of Commerce |
| <i>Soil Exposure Pathway, Resident Population Threat</i> | | |
| <i>Observed Contamination</i> | | |
| | Contaminated Soil: Background and Release | Sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, site history, soil survey, sample location map |
| | Sample locations | |
| | Sample depth | |
| | Sample similarity | |
| | Interference Rationale | Information on mode of deposition |
| | Other Sources | Site history, sampling and analysis plan, field logbook, survey sample location map, topographic map |
| | Sample Location | |
| | Sample Depth | |
| | Source Boundary | |
| | Attribution | See Surface Water Pathway suggestions |
| <i>Waste Quantity</i> | | |
| | Source Type | Site history, field logbook, survey, affidavits, manifests |
| | Calculations | Field logbook, survey, affidavits, field logbook, topographic map, sample location map, measuring instruments with worksheets |
| <i>Targets</i> | | |
| | Residents | Field logbook, sample location map, sampling and analysis plan, plat maps, House by House survey (actual count), U.S. Census Bureau Web site |
| | On Property and within 200 feet | |
| | Population per household | |
| | Students | Topographic map, sample location map, board of education, survey/interview with school management staff (actual count) |
| | School Location | |
| | Number of Students | |
| | Workers | Topographic map, sample location map, field logbook, survey (actual count), facility records, Chamber of Commerce |
| | Location | |
| | Number | |
| | Level of Contamination | Sample analytical result, HRS/SCDM benchmark |
| | Sensitive Environments | U.S. Fish and Wildlife, USDA Forest Service, National Park Service NWI map, sample location map, field biologist, field logbook |
| | Official Designation | |
| | Location | |
| | Habitat Range | |

^a Whenever secondary references are cited (e.g., most sample investigation reports), the scoring information should be further supported by a primary reference (e.g., field logbooks). See the *Regional QC Guidance Manual* (EPA Publication 9345.1-08, December 1991), Section 2.4.1, p. 16, for examples of primary versus secondary reference sources.

Work Assignment Form. (WebForms v1.0)